

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

940.3
N 62

41665

MODERN AGE

[A Short History of Modern Times, 1815-1919]

**NIRMAL C. SINHA,
M.A.**

Price 1/8

Published by
Kunda Bhawan Bhaduri
Bharati Bhavan, Calcutta and
printed by J. C. Sarkhel,
at the Calcutta Oriental Press, Ltd.,
9, Panchanan Ghose Lane,
CALCUTTA.

All rights reserved for Bharati Bhavan.

•The author's thanks are due to Messrs. N. Bagchi and
N. Ganguli who very kindly volunteered to work as amanuenses.

INTRODUCTION.

The World in 1815 started with the legacy of the French Revolution and the successful experiment of Republicanism in America as also with the issues raised by the socio-economic phenomenon known as the Industrial Revolution. Thus while democracy and nationalism would occupy the stage for a longtime since 1815, imperialism and socialism—the twins of the Industrial Revolution—would, with the passage of time, gain the upperhand in moulding the history of the age.

In 1815 legitimacy—as the monarchist cause was christened in contradistinction to the novel ideas of the French Revolution—was trampling liberalism underfoot; in 1919, republicanism was celebrating the funeral of divine right and absolute monarchy. In 1815 national aspirations of the peoples in Europe were trampled upon by legitimists and imperialists; in 1919 the victory of nationalism brought about the fall of its historic enemies, the Habsburgs, the Hohenzollerns, the Romanovs and the Ottomans. Even the unchanging East had caught the spell of democracy and nationalism.

In 1815 the East was in a hopelessly moribund condition, an easy victim to Western exploitation. The ignominy of foreign conquests combined with the rationalistic civilisation of the West served to administer an elixir to the dying nations of the East.

A century after the East was asserting under the leadership of Japan and Turkey.

In 1815 the only great imperial power was Britain, in 1919 Japan was becoming her serious rival. In 1815 the British Empire consisted of a number of colonies scattered throughout the world and thanks to Clive, Warren Hastings and Wellesley the nucleus of the Indian Empire; in 1919 the British nation could boast of an empire where the sun never set. In 1815 the British Empire shorn of the American colonies held out no promise either to mother country or to the colonies; a century after the Empire had become a commonwealth of free nations as far as the white portions were concerned. In 1815 in India the *Company-Raj* was hailed as the deliverer of the ryots; since 1919 political unrest has been the central fact in India.

In 1815 democracy was the bugbear of wisemen, in 1919 it was socialism. The success and triumph of democracy were due to the rise of the bourgeoisie, the class built up by the Industrial Revolution. The progress of socialism since 1919 has been due, to the shortcomings of the bourgeoisie, as for example, the criminal folly of rationalisation, as also the issues created by the Versailles Treaty. Throughout our period democracy and nationalism had to fight against legitimism, clericalism and imperialism. Since 1919 socialism and pacifism have been fighting against capitalism and nationalism.

CONTENTS

Europe 1815-1914

	Page
The Vienna Settlement	1
The Concert of Europe	6
Metternich and Central Europe ...	16
Growth of Democracy in Britain and France	35
The Italian Risorgimento	54
The Smaller Countries: 1815-1848 ...	66
The Second Republic and the Second Empire	77
The Unification of Italy	95
The Unification of Germany	111
Problems of Latin Europe (1870-1914) ...	144
The German Empire	154
Russia	172

Near East 1815-1914

The Eastern Question	195
The Young Turks and the Balkan Wars ...	215

Far East

The Opening of China	221
Foreign Impact on Japan	235
The Scramble in the Far East	244
The Establishment of Chinese Republic ...	256

Greater Europe

The Expansion of Europe	262
British Commonwealth of Free Nations			270

America

Slavery and Civil War in America	...		277
American Foreign Policy	284

The First World War

Diplomacy : 1870-1914	289
The Coming of the War	300
The First World War	309
The Consequences	334

MODERN AGE

THE VIENNA SETTLEMENT

Fall of Napoleon :

"The Battle of Waterloo", said Napoleon, "will be as dangerous to the liberties of Europe as the battle of Philippi was dangerous to the liberties of Rome." The earnest of this reaction was foreshadowed by the peace settlement which sealed the doom of Napoleon, and his system. This settlement is known as the Vienna Settlement as the statesmen and the plenipotentiaries of the great powers met at the Austrian Capital and after a prolonged discussion settled the terms of peace there. Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, presided over the deliberations of the Congress; Czar Alexander I and Castlereagh, the British Foreign Secretary, were among the most influential delegates.

The territorial arrangements of the Vienna Congress :

Three chief principles moulded the Vienna Settlement : that of rewards to the victors and retribution to the defeated, that of restoring where it was possible pre-

revolutionary conditions, and that of providing guarantees for the future peace of Europe.

Russia acquired the grand-duchy of Warsaw in its entirety except Posen and Thorn, and Finland (from Sweden).

Prussia acquired the Duchy of Posen with Thorn and Danzig, Northern Saxony, Swedish Pomerania and a huge slice of territory on both sides of the Rhine. Prussian demand for Alsace and Lorraine was however not complied with.

Austria surrendered Netherlands (Belgium) to Holland and acquired Venetia and Lombardy. She also acquired the Illyrian province and Eastern Galicia (from Russia) and Tyrol (from Bavaria).

The statesmen at Vienna Congress acknowledged the disappearance of the Holy Roman Empire and provided a ramshackle federation for Germany. The result was a confederation of 39 sovereign princes and free cities, known as the Germanic Bund. A federal diet was to sit at Frankfurt-on-Main under the presidency of Austria. The several states agreed to defend Germany as a whole.

Great Britain acquired Malta, Heligoland, a protectorate over the Ionian Islands, the Cape of Good Hope (from Holland) and retained Trinidad (from Spain), Mauritius, Tobago, St. Lucia (from France) and Ceylon (from Holland). She induced the Powers to issue a declaration against the slave-trade.

Italy remained a mere geographical expression. The Bourbon king once more reigned over the two Sicilies ; the Pope was again master of the Church ; Austria acquired Lombardy and Venetia ; Parma, Modena and Tuscany passed to petty despots ; while Victor Emmanuel I was restored to Piedmont and Savoy with the important addition of Genoa. Thus at the Congress of Vienna Italian national aspirations met with no better fate than that of Germany.

Belgium was added to Holland, and Norway torn from Denmark was united to Sweden to compensate the Swedish loss of Finland and Pomerania. Switzerland was restored to the pre-revolutionary position and her neutrality was guaranteed.

The return of the Bourbons to France and Spain was sanctioned. France lost her conquests acquired during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic era.

Criticism and defence of the Vienna Settlement :

The Vienna Congress provided the nineteenth century Europe with a state-system which was neither permanent, nor happy. The settlement paid more respect to the dynastic interest and the principles of legitimacy and balance of power than the nascent ideas of nationality and popular sovereignty. Belgians and Dutchmen were opposed in race, creed and historical tradition, and Belgium broke away from this union fifteen years after. Norway secured her independence ninety years after.

The nationalists of Italy and Germany met with a rebuff at Vienna. The Great Powers were merely scrambling for territorial gains. They had no idea that they were violently setting back the hands of the clock by ignoring the legacy left by the French Revolution and the Bonapartist regime. All the wars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been fought among others on the issues created by the Vienna Congress.

Be it said to the credit of the Vienna Statesmen that they wore the spectacles not of the mid-nineteenth century but of 1815. The historians who criticise the Vienna Settlement often forget that they have grown wise after the event. The Vienna Statesmen were dealing with the problems as contemporaries and as politicians and not as visionaries and historians born decades after it. The main object of these statesmen was to overthrow the Napoleonic Empire completely and to make its restoration impossible. They earnestly desired to provide Europe with a fairly long period of peace. The union of Belgium with Holland was meant to check any ambitious designs on the part of France. For at least fifteen years, a strong buffer state separated France from the petty states of Germany. Secondly, the Statesmen at Vienna had their hands tied by several commitments and treaties entered into during the fateful years of 1812-14. The cessions of Norway to Sweden and Belgium to Holland, had been the subject of pledges before the diplomatists met at Vienna and to have repudiated the pledges would have meant not only a breach of faith but also an inci-

table renewal of war. Further, it is wrong to charge the Vienna diplomats with having worked with no principles. They were all along guided by the principles of legitimacy and expediency. The example of the Reign of Terror in France forbade them to flirt with the idea of democracy. Nationalism also had not proved its case by 1815. National spirit in France engendered imperialism and the nationalism which Napoleon had evoked in Germany and Spain was rather fitful and erratic. To sum up, we must admit that the Vienna Settlement was singularly successful in curbing the French passion for territorial aggrandisement and in meeting the claims of the victorious allies.

These considerations mitigate the severity of the judgment that history must pass on the Congress. Yet it cannot be asserted that the statesmen concerned were equal to the opportunity presented to them. They were limited in outlook, too prone to compromise, lacking in faith and courage. They were content with expedients. They were men of their own generation ; and though they secured for Europe a breathing space of peace and in one or two minor points, such as, their declaration against slave-trade and the regulation of international rivers, did much for the future of civilisation, they did little else to win the gratitude of posterity.

References :

Webster : The Congress of Vienna.

Hearnshaw : Main Currents of European History.

THE CONCERT OF EUROPE & THE HOLY ALLIANCE

The experience of the Napoleonic wars had aroused in the minds of European statesmen, especially those of the allied countries, a desire for greater international security and for some machinery for mutual protection. This desire inspired the statesmen who met at Vienna to attempt a very interesting political experiment. Thus originated the idea of the Concert of Europe—which was to guarantee mutual protection and secure concerted action among European powers. •

The idea was not new. Henry IV of France and Count Kaunitz of Austria had some faint vision of an international confederation. It was also a commonplace of Revolutionary philosophy and it entered into the politics of Napoleon. At the fall of Napoleon, three great statesmen were eagerly discussing the idea and its application. The result was two entirely different, if not conflicting, schemes: the Holy Alliance and the Quadruple Alliance. The Holy Alliance sprung from the brain of Czar Alexander. It was proclaimed on September 26, 1815. The Quadruple Alliance was mainly due to the efforts of Count Metternich, the minister of Austria, and came into existence on November 20, 1815.

The Holy Alliance :

The Holy Alliance was not exactly a treaty, though the monarchs of Russia, Prussia and Austria were parties to it.

It was a solemn declaration initiated by Alexander and affirmed by the sovereigns of Europe with varying degrees of seriousness. The declaration ran as follows : "...The eternal religion of God far from being applicable only to private life should on the contrary influence the resolutions of princes and guide all their steps. ...The three contracting monarchs will live united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity ... to protect religion, peace and justice." Louis XVIII and other monarchs joined the Alliance. The Sultan of Turkey was not invited. Great Britain refused to sign on constitutional grounds, but the Prince Regent signified his personal approval.

The Holy Alliance was indeed very popular with the monarchs of Europe as it was based upon the Holy Religion, and at the same time it revived the Divine Right theory. But it could achieve nothing as it had no political machinery and as Britain stood aloof. Metternich described it as verbiage, Castlereagh regarded it as a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense. Ordinary people, however, generally confused it with another experiment, viz., the Quadruple Alliance. Though it achieved nothing it certainly involved the principle of the Concert of Europe and as such it has some claim to importance in the history of internationalism.

The Quadruple Alliance :

If the Holy Alliance was the dream of a mystic, the Quadruple Alliance of the 20th November, 1815, was a

substantial diplomatic fact. It was concluded between Austria, Russia, Prussia and England and it provided for a twenty years' alliance to be maintained by periodical meetings between the sovereigns or their pleni-potentiaries. These meetings were to be called for consideration of issues involving the maintenance of the peace of Europe and the prosperity of nations. This alliance did not end in a fiasco. Congresses and conferences were held at intervals to consider questions of international peace and "national prosperity". ✓

The first congress was held in 1818 at Aix-la-Chapelle. The most important issue before it was the problem of France. Up to this time, the Quadruple Alliance was more or less an alliance against France. This congress happily decided to put an end to such a situation. It ordered that the foreign troops should evacuate France. This wise and sympathetic decision to some extent soothed the wounded feelings of the great nation, which had only a few years ago been the mistress of the continent. France was also admitted to the alliance, and the Quadruple Alliance became a "moral pentarchy". We owe this verbiage to Alexander I who vainly attempted at Aix-la-Chapelle to galvanise his Holy Alliance into life. Secondly, this congress succeeded to some extent in asserting its authority as a Court of Appeal for Europe. It compelled the Swedish King to carry out its treaty obligations with regard to Denmark and considered certain dynastic questions of Germany. But it failed to establish its authority over

the Spanish Colonies, mainly due to British resistance. Thirdly, the congress discussed the question of slave-trade and piracy, but failed to devise any means to check either of these on account of clash of interests between Britain and Russia. In general, the Congress was a great triumph for Metternich and a moral defeat for Alexander. It also exposed the weakness of the European alliance on account of conflicting interests of the member states. Armed with the authority of the Congress Metternich launched a crusade against the revolutionary movements in Germany, but Castlereagh did not approve his Carlsbad Decrees, (Sept. 1818). It showed that Castlereagh and Metternich, the two great champions of the Concert, upheld different political views.

The next conference took place at Troppau (October 1820) which concluded its discussions in an adjourned conference at Laibach (January 1821). Revolutions had broken out in the early months of 1820 in Naples, Spain and Portugal. All the five powers of the Alliance had been strongly moved by these revolutionary outbursts. Hence the agenda at Troppau and Laibach almost exclusively concerned these revolutions. The Troppau conference was attended by Alexander I and Metternich among others. Castlereagh was conspicuous by his absence. On November 19, 1820, Austria, Prussia and Russia signed a protocol by which they bound themselves to united intervention if revolutionary changes in any state threatened any other state. Thus they constituted themselves into an "international police against revo-

lution". France with some reservations accepted the protocol, but Castlereagh protested against it on the principle of state sovereignty. As the Napolitan question was not fully discussed, the conference was adjourned. It met again at Laibach. The Bourbon King of Naples came to Laibach to ask the help of the allies to restore absolutism in Naples. The allies decided that an Austrian army should be sent to help, but Metternich pressed for the moral support of the Allies also. British resistance to such intervention in internal affairs would have caused a breach in the alliance, had there been no Greek revolt. The news of the Greek revolt and the enthusiasm of Russia to protect the Greeks made Austria and Britain sink their differences. The Austrian army suppressed the Neapolitan revolt and also another revolt in Piedmont. France, with the Ultra-Royalist party in power, was anxious to intervene in Spain in favour of legitimacy, but Britain was strongly opposed to this. France wisely decided to secure the approval of the allies before taking action.

The next congress was held at Verona (October to December 1822). On account of the importance of the issues raised by the revolts in Spain and Greece, Britain sent Wellington as pleni-potentiary. British foreign policy was no longer conducted by Castlereagh; Canning had succeeded Castlereagh on the latter's tragic death. Canning was bent upon fighting hard and fighting clean, and hence sent an able statesman of continental fame like Wellington. When the congress opened, the question of

Spain was the only one raised. Alexander favoured European intervention and offered a hundred and fifty thousand Russian troops. France objected to the passage of Russian troops through France, and Britain stood firm against intervention by a foreign power. Russia, Prussia and Austria decided to give France moral and material support, if necessary. (Wellington refused to support intervention in any form, and withdrew from further discussions. The breach was complete.) (On the 7th April 1823, France led an army into Spain. England could not oppose without risking a war. But a few months after, England paid France back in her own coins on the question of Spanish colonies.)

The Question of the Spanish Colonies :

When Spain could not suppress the revolt in her colonies Metternich and Alexander favoured the idea of sending an expedition across the Atlantic in favour of legitimacy. After the successful campaign of the French in Spain, France suggested that the question of the Spanish colonies should be referred to a new congress of the Powers. Russia was eager to support France. An European Armada, both France and Russia believed, would not only restore the revolted colonies to Spain, but also secure for France and Russia fresh territorial acquisitions. The idea would have been put into application but for the resistance of U.S.A. and Britain.

‘ Foiled in Old Spain Canning turned to the New and “sought materials of compensation in another hemisphere”.

The Spaniards of America had been fighting for two decades. Many outrages had been committed on British ships and traders and as the British could not get compensation from Madrid, Canning determined to deal with the insurgents directly. He made up his mind not only to recognise them as belligerents but even as independent peoples. In October, 1823, France was informed that no intervention would be allowed. Before the end of 1823, Canning appointed consuls to these colonies. On the 2nd December, 1823, President Monroe sent his (now) famous message to the Senate—"That any interference on the part of the Great Powers of Europe for the purpose of oppressing or controlling the destiny of the Spanish American States which have declared their independence, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, and would be considered as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards them." The unholy concert of Europe could do nothing but protest against the concerted stand of the two Anglican nations. Canning recognised the independence of Buenos Ayres, Columbia and Mexico in 1824; and of Bolivia, Chile and Peru in 1825.

The Revolt in Portugal :

France had also the desire to intervene in Portugal. There, as in Spain, the reactionary party looked for support to France, and the liberal party to Great Britain. Canning decided to intervene to repel another intervention. A British squadron was sent in the first stage. Later, British troops were landed. This led to the

triumph of the liberal party. Canning also induced John VI. King of Portugal, to recognise the independence of Brazil under his son Don Pedro. After the death of John VI, in 1826, factions again broke out in Portugal, and Spain and France planned to interfere. But Canning took prompt action and the liberal party triumphed.

The Break-up of the Alliance :

The weakness of the alliance lay in the fact that there was no unity of interest or outlook among the member states. Castlereagh had protested against Metternich's policy of intervention. His successor Canning was not content with mere protest but followed protest with action. English action with regard to the Spanish colonies and Portugal made the breach complete. The last conference which was held under the authority of the Alliance was that of St. Petersburg (1825). Here Russia expressed her attitude to consider the Eastern Question from her own point of view. ✓ The Greek War of Independence found Russia sympathetic towards Greece, and Austria sympathetic towards Turkey. The breach between Austria and Russia tolled the death-knell of the alliance.

Causes of the Failure of the Alliance :

The Alliance failed apparently because of the following reasons : (1) The Alliance degenerated into a league of autocrats presided over by Metternich ; (2) the strange-paradoxical character of Alexander I and (3) chill caution of Castlereagh and Jacobinism of Canning. It failed really because : (1) it sought to perpetuate the

unjust system of Vienna and (2) it entirely ignored the claims of the peoples.

Permanent Services rendered by the Alliance :

The European Alliance of 1815-25 marks a stage in the development of international law as it bequeathed to Europe the idea for the respect of treaty-rights and obligations. It also proved the efficacy of concerted action for maintaining peace.

The European Alliance and the League of Nations:

It is very interesting to compare the two international organisations engendered by the two great wars: the Napoleonic War and the Great War. (1) Both grew out of war. Both started as an alliance against an aggressive power. The entrance of France broke the Alliance; the withdrawal of Nazi Germany weakened the League. (2) The Alliance created by Castlereagh, Metternich and Czar Alexander depended for its success on their personal relations. The death of Castlereagh and the conversion of Alexander broke it up. The League was imposed by President Wilson backed by General Smuts upon unwilling European statesmen. The death of Wilson did not affect the League. (3) The Alliance was not an association of peoples. The League is an association of nations. Though the head of U.S.A. was its creator, U.S.A. could not join it as the people of U.S.A. were suspicious of its real aims. Though one may pertinently question as to how far the League has become the forum of subject nations, it cannot be gainsaid that the

League stands for the nations and not for the dynasties. (4) There was no place in the Alliance for smaller powers. The League is not so; though the greater powers enjoy more privileges. (5) The alliance was confined to Europe and the world-wide interest of Britain broke it up. The League is a world-wide organisation. (6) The ideal of the Alliance was to rigorously maintain treaties. Article XIX of the League Covenant is definitely against such principle. (7) The Alliance interfered in internal concerns of states. The League does not claim so, though it has a department to study and suggests means of improvement of the conditions of labour in the member countries. (8) The Alliance had no effective machinery. The League has a definite constitution and a large complex machinery for its work.

References :

Webster : European Alliance 1815-1825.

Phillips : Confederation of Europe.

Marriot : European Commonwealth.

Garner : Recent Developments in International Law.

METTERNICH AND CENTRAL EUROPE (1815—1851)

Foiled by Britain in his scheme of Alliance, Metternich concentrated his attention in home politics and very soon proved that he was at least master in his own house. For more than thirty years since the fall of Napoleon, Metternich controlled the affairs of Central Europe more than anybody else.

Early Career of Metternich :

Count Clemens Metternich was born at Coblenz on the 15th May, 1773, and came of a very noble German family. His father was an official in the diplomatic service of the Holy Roman Empire and the young Clemens grew up in the aristocratic atmosphere of the Habsburg court. While a student at the University of Strassburg, he acquired a distaste for the French Revolution. He very soon attracted the notice of the famous Austrian Chancellor Count Kaunitz and married his grand-daughter in 1795. Henceforth his rise was rapid. In 1801 he entered the Austrian service and served successively at Dresden, Berlin, St. Petersburg and Paris. Thus he gained an extra-ordinary diplomatic experience. In 1809, he became the actual head of the Austrian government under Emperor Francis I. He realised that the Habsburg Empire rested upon a volcano and from the outset determined to prop up the Empire by means of successful foreign diplomacy. He

hated Napoleon as one whose family estates have been seized less than a decade ago by the Corsican adventurer, as an official of the Empire which Napoleon sought to curb and as a German who found in Napoleon a descendant of Louis XIV. But Metternich was also afraid of Russian domination in the event of Napoleon's downfall. Thus from 1810 to 1813 he resorted to a policy of 'divide and rule' by playing off Napoleon and Czar Alexander against each other. When the Continental system and other projects of Napoleon evoked German nationalism, Metternich definitely broke away from Napoleon. The Austrian intervention was the decisive factor henceforth. On the fall of Napoleon, Metternich emerged as the greatest personality of the age.

Before following further the career of Metternich, we should study the results upon Central Europe of the wars which terminated in Waterloo. Thus we shall be in a position to appreciate the forces amidst which Metternich worked from 1815 onwards.

Results of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars :

The most visible result of these wars was the vanishing away of the old ghost of the Holy Roman Empire. In 1806 Napoleon dissolved it, and the Habsburg Emperor took the new title of the Emperor of Austria. Both the Revolution and Napoleon exercised great and permanent influence upon Central Europe. The new ideas which came from France could not but attract the notice of the progressive elements in Germany, though these

ideas were unfortunately coming in the trail of French bullets. Napoleon unconsciously laid the foundation of a united Germany. His policy of eliminating the host of petty states from the German body-politic merely served to start the process of unification. His "mediatisation" serves as the convenient starting point in the history of German unification. By pushing his own dynastic interests in Germany and by oppressing German peoples he ultimately inspired them to unite against the common enemy. Thus these wars, though they brought a lot of miseries on the German people, served to make the ideas of democracy and nationalism popular in Central Europe.

The Settlement of 1815 :

By the Peace Settlement of Vienna, Prussia received many important Rhenish territories, and Austria received Venetia-Lombardy and some territories from Bavaria, in lieu of Belgium. Thus the territorial settlement of 1815 made Prussia an important north-German State, not unfit to be the leading state of north Germany. Austria on the other hand in search of an Adriatic sea-board took reluctant non-German territories and gave up the strategically important province of Belgium. (Three foreign states were however interested in German politics. British Crown held Hanover, Holland, Luxemburg and Denmark, Holstein. We shall see later how accident and war eliminated British and Danish interests.)

The number of states had decreased from 300 to 39

and a federal constitution was provided for the German states. This was the Bund, and a diet was to sit at Frankfurt under the presidency of Austria. The states agreed to defend Germany as a whole and its component states against any attack and mutually to guarantee the territories of all members of the Bund. It was further agreed that representative institutions should be established in every state. But neither nationalism nor democracy gained anything from these arrangements and ideas. The Bund was a loose confederation and the states were ruled by more or less absolute princes. Whenever the disappointed liberals made any attempt to move towards nationalism, the despotic rulers specially of the petty states would check and oppress them. Metternich was the guiding genius in this policy of reaction. He realised that the Habsburg Empire consisting of various nationalities and based upon feudalism and other institutions of Ancien Regime must not flirt with the ideas of nationalism and democracy.

Reaction and Repression in Central Europe from 1815 :

Article XIII of the Act of Confederation declared that there should be Assemblies in all the states of the Confederation. Charles Augustus, Duke of Weimar, the patron of Goethe and friend of liberalism, set up a constitution to Metternich's disgust. Some of the south German princes also granted charters, though these princes were more or less lukewarm and even Frederick William

III promised a constitution to Prussia. But Frederick's promise remained unredeemed as he very soon fell under the influence of Metternich. Metternich exploited a festival at Wartburg to gain support of the German princes. The students of Jena had arranged a festival at Wartburg to commemorate the tercentenary of the Reformation (which, the Germans still take pride in pointing out, was started by Martin Luther) and the 4th anniversary of the Battle of Leipzig (17th Oct., 1817). The occasion was devoid of serious significance, but was sufficient to excite the alarm of the reactionaries. The Duke of Weimar was warned. In 1819 the murder of a playwright named Kotzebue, who was suspected to be an agent of Czar Alexander, confirmed the alarm. Metternich summoned representatives of the leading states at a conference at Carlsbad and secured the passage of a number of reactionary measures. The decrees subsequently endorsed by the Diet at Frankfurt are known as Carlsbad Decrees. They extinguished the liberty of the press; put the universities under the control of the government officials; forbade the formation of societies and holding of political meetings; and established a commission to discover and punish democratic agitators. Well could Metternich boast: "By the help of God I hope to defeat the German revolution just as I vanquished the Conqueror of the world."

Metternich's success was complete and until 1830 matters went on with little change. Following the July Revolution in France (see next section) certain popular

upheavals took place in Germany. Some concessions were exacted from rulers in Hanover, Saxony, Hesse and Brunswick in the north, and in Baden and Bavaria in the south. But Metternich was not yet out. He remained firm and cool and at the Diet of 1832 confirmed the Carlsbad Decrees. The Diet also prohibited state legislation which might weaken the object of the confederation. Thus the movement of 1830 as far as Germany is concerned achieved nothing permanent.

The Zollverein :

The sole political event of this period to which the Germans can look back with pleasure is the formation of a Zollverein or Customs-Union. It began with a small trade agreement in 1819 between Prussia and Schwarzburg-Sondershausen so insignificant in its origin that at first it had the support of Metternich ; the treaty was on the basis of free trade. German industry was tangled by innumerable customs barriers between state and state and there was need for breaking down these barriers. Soon the Zollverein movement became popular and by 1836 practically all the German states except Austria incorporated themselves into a vast tariff-union under the leadership of Prussia ; all internal tariff-barriers were removed and a common external tariff was arranged.

The Zollverein had a threefold significance. It provided the states of Germany a strong financial and economic union ; it encouraged the sentiment of nationalism by means of economic unity and it accustomed

the German states to move forward without Austria and with Prussia. The Zollverein represented a great victory for Prussia over Austria. A sharp difference of interest arose between Austria and the rest of Germany. Long after Austria found to her dismay that Prussia had stolen a march over Austria. ✓

Internal Affairs of the Habsburg Empire (1815-1848) :

The Habsburg Empire was a mosaic state composed of two kingdoms and twelve races : Germans, Magyars, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenes, Croats, Serbs, Slovenes, Italians, Rumanians and Jews. Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenes, Slovaks, Croats and Serbs were loosely grouped as Slavs, though there was really no keen fellow-feeling *inter-se*, the only bond of union between them was their common subjection. Hence nationalism which in Germany and Italy was a force working towards union, for the Habsburg Empire it stood as a centrifugal force. To check the disintegration of his hodge-podge state, Metternich relied on a large and well-trained army and carried to perfection a policy of divide and rule : Hungarian regiments garrisoned Italy ; Italians guarded Austrian Poland ; Germans occupied Bohemia ; Czechs defended Austria proper and Slavs with Germans were stationed in Hungary. To combat the danger of the infiltration of revolutionary ideas from abroad, a wall of tariffs and censors was raised around Austria ; the press was rigidly supervised and education was put under the control of

the church. Studies in literature, philosophy and history were almost tabooed. The result was that the students of Vienna had to concentrate on medicine only, as medicine had no political creed. For thirty years almost all the energies of Viennese scholars were spent upon medicine and surgery. On the fall of Metternich in 1848, the University of Vienna emerged as a great centre of medical science. Few of us today know that Vienna's claim as the foremost centre of surgical operations has a history of political stagnation as its background. Music was also immune from Metternich's taboo, and like medicine, Vienna attained some perfection in music during the thirty years of Metternich's rule. In spite of Metternich, national movements grew in strength; Metternich was merely driving them underground. The July Revolution of 1830 passed without any echoes in the Habsburg Empire, but the risings in Germany and Italy prompted Metternich to take a sterner attitude. In 1835, Francis II was succeeded by Ferdinand I who was an incapable and somewhat epileptic ruler. This meant uncontrolled power for Metternich. But the nationalist movements specially in Hungary were growing in strength.

•Hungary and Louis Kossuth :

In the Hungarian Diet a liberal party cropped up which held radical views of government and society. This party was led by Louis Kossuth. Kossuth first came into prominence as the editor of a paper which described in forceful language the debates in the Diet.

When it was forbidden to print these reports, he had them lithographed and when this was also forbidden he had them written out by hand by a band of volunteers. Finally he was arrested and sentenced to prison. During his imprisonment of three years Kossuth applied himself to serious studies and specially to the English language. In 1840 he was released and obtained permission to edit a daily paper. He soon became the hero of the nation as a brilliant editor and as an even more brilliant orator, he conducted an agitation. He was a true democrat and wished to erase all distinctions between the classes and the masses and urged for equality of rights, democratic government, trial by jury and reform of the criminal court. In 1847, the liberal party published its programme drawn up by Francis Deak, another striking personality of the age. The party demanded the taxation of the nobles, the Diet's control over national expenditure, liberty for the press and right of holding public meeting. But the crowning demand was that Hungary should not be subordinate to Austrian policy. Such was the situation when the great reform wave of 1848 began to sweep over Europe.

The Revolutions of 1848 :

In February 1848, a revolution took place in France (see next section). It led to the collapse of Louis Philippe, the king of France. This served as a signal for all the discontented elements in Europe. "When France catches cold, Europe sneezes"—was an epigram of Metter-

nich, and ironically enough when France caught cold in February 1848, Central Europe sneezed much. Of the various revolutions one of the first in order of time and the most significant of all was that which broke out in Vienna on March 13. The once-mighty minister, controller of the continent and the guiding genius of the anti-revolutionary crusade, requested the Emperor that since his presence was no longer required he might be allowed to resign. In the disguise of an elderly Englishman and accompanied by his wife, Metternich departed quietly for London. The fall of Metternich was more significant than that of Louis Philippe, King of France. It encouraged fresh hopes in the minds of the progressive elements in Central Europe. Revolutions took place in the provinces of the Habsburg Empire and in various states of Germany. The grand-duke of Baden had to grant a new constitution by which ministerial responsibility, freedom of the press, trial by jury and equality of taxation were secured. The rulers of Nassau, Hesse-Cassel, Weimar and Brunswick followed suit. King Louis of Bavaria abdicated and his son Maximilian II granted many of the demands of the liberals. Saxony and Hanover ultimately followed the lead of Baden.

Revolution in Prussia :

Frederick William IV had notions of divine right sovereignty, with some soft feelings for constitutional progress. In the first month of the revolution he yielded: he granted a constitution; he headed a

procession through the streets of Berlin wearing over his uniform a red, gold and black sash, the colours of the Holy Roman Empire ; and he declared himself in favour of German nationalism and said that Prussia was merged in Germany. But with the triumph of absolutism in Vienna and in other German states he began to fall under the influence of force of reaction. The revolution in Berlin was suppressed with the help of his uncle, Count Brandenburg. A new constitution with definite leanings towards an irresponsible system of executive was granted.

The Fate of the Revolutions in the Habsburg Empire :

The revolutionaries of Vienna were at first very successful ; the censorship of the press was abolished and the government was forced to call an assembly elected by universal suffrage. The assembly thus elected suppressed all distinctions between nobles and commons. This was the principal result of the revolution in Vienna (May-August). The Imperial government first directed its attention towards the revolution in Italy (July-August). General Radetzky restored the status quo. In the meantime general Windischgratz put down the Czech revolt and Bohemia was placed under martial law (June). Hungary however proved to be very tough. But the Hungarians in their relations to the Slavs of Illyria were as imperialistic as the Austrians to the Hungarians. The Illyrians accordingly under their own leader Jellachich threw in their lot with the Austrians. The Imperial

government appointed Jellachich commander of an invading army. The Hungarian Diet denied the authority of the Empire and elected Kossuth President. This was equivalent to a declaration of war and an Austrian army was ordered against them. The people of Vienna sympathising with the Hungarians rose in arms. Jellachich and Windischgratz took Vienna by storm. Vienna was placed under martial law and democratic chiefs were shot (October-November). The success of the Imperial government was complete as far as the home province was concerned. A new ministry was formed with Prince Schwarzenberg, the brother-in-law of general Windischgratz. In order to rejuvenate the monarchy, Emperor Ferdinand I was induced to abdicate in favour of his eighteen years old nephew Francis Joseph (Dec. 2, 1848). This was done specially with a view to permit the Imperial Government to abrogate the constitution of Hungary (Emperor Ferdinand had given his consent to a new constitution drawn up by the Hungarian leaders). It was held that Ferdinand's oath bound him personally, and not his successors. Hungary refused to accept the new Emperor and declared war in defence of the old, and of the constitution to which he was a party. Hungary was invaded from all directions but as the Slav revolt against Hungary quietened, the Hungarians had no difficulty in driving out Windischgratz. A republic was established with Kossuth as President and all connections were cut off with Austria (April 1849). (This was a retort to Schwarzenberg's edict of March 1849, by which a centra-

lised unitary government was declared in the Habsburg Empire). Thus an accomplished fact was presented by the Hungarians. But the Imperial government had not yet come to the end of its resources. The Emperor asked help from the Czar of Russia, Nicholas I, "against the party of the European revolution." The Magyars in vain sought help from the Slavs and the Turks. In June two hundred thousand Russians invaded and the principal Hungarian army capitulated to the Russians at Vilagos. The Austrian commander Haynau also contributed much to the defeat of the Hungarians. By October 1849 the Hungarian War of Independence was over. Kossuth fled to Turkey and the Sultan strongly supported by Palmerston refused to give him up. Haynau punished the rebels with great severity. This general very soon earned the nick-name of hyena. (He visited England in 1850 and received some injuries due to negligence on the part of some draymen. Palmerston excused their action on the ground that Haynau was a great moral criminal.)

Thus by 1850 the Imperial government triumphed completely over the revolutionaries. The Habsburg Empire rose phoenix-like from the ashes of 1848. Lack of concerted movement and lack of fellow-feeling among the subject nations proved to be the salvation of the Empire.

Frankfurt Parliament (1848-49) :

The most interesting and the most significant of the German revolutionary movements of 1848 was the Frank-

furt Parliament. On March 5, 1848, a meeting of liberals at Heidelberg arranged for the summoning of a Vorparlament (preparatory parliament) to take measures for calling a national parliament. The Vorparlament met at Frankfurt (March 31-April 3) and convoked a national parliament on the basis of universal suffrage. The national parliament met at Frankfurt in May 1848. It was accepted by the Diet in the name of the princes. Merchants, manufacturers and landowners were poorly represented, whereas officials, lawyers and professors thronged heavily. The deliberations of the National Parliament suffered seriously from the lack of political experience of most of its members.

Much time was wasted in discussing the abstract rights of the people, the respective merits of various types of constitutions, the geographical distribution of the Teutonic peoples and other kindred topics. Among the many difficulties which confronted the parliament the most serious was that concerning the relations of Habsburg Empire to the Germanic body. On this point there were two parties: the Big Germans and the Little Germans. The Big Germans including the Austrian deputies and those of the Catholic States of the south stoutly advocated the inclusion of the whole of the Austrian Empire. The Little Germans looking to the headship of Prussia and fearing the preponderance of the Habsburg Empire insisted that the inclusion of the Austrian Empire would mean the artificial embedding of the foreign flesh in the Teutonic body. Again as regards a federal executive Austria

favoured a Directory of seven princes while the Little Germans insisted on a hereditary empire. On both points the latter eventually carried their points and in March 1849 the new constitution was completed. On March 28, the Imperial Crown was offered to Frederick William IV of Prussia but by this time the situation had materially altered. Austria had emerged triumphant from the revolution and Schwarzenberg was no unworthy successor of Metternich. Frederick William, the upholder of divine right monarchy could not stoop low "to pick up a Crown out of the mud" and that with the added apprehension of incurring the wrath of Austria. The offer was, to the great dismay of the progressives definitely declined. Thus the National Parliament ended in a fiasco. It showed that the fate of Germany depended not upon the National Parliament but upon military power of Prussia and Austria. "Not by the speeches and resolutions of the majority are the mighty problems of the age to be solved but by blood and iron",—this was the lesson of 1858.

The Problem of Schleswig-Holstein :

The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein belonged to the king of Denmark as Duke. The duchies formed a member-state of the German Confederation of 1815 as the peoples were predominantly German. The Salic Law of succession through males was in force in the duchies but not in Denmark. In January 1848, Christian VIII, king of Denmark, died. His son and successor, Frederick VII, had no male children. In March 1848, the people

of the duchies encouraged by the success of revolutions elsewhere formed a provisional government under the Duke of Augustenburg, and Frederick VII sent an army against them. The German Diet recognised the provisional government and with its approval Frederick William IV sent an army. The Schleswig-Holstein question greatly stimulated national feeling in Germany. After the fiasco of the National Parliament, Frederick William grew timid. He accepted the advice of Austria and withdrew the troops.

The Capitulation of Olmutz :

• Schwarzenburg took full advantage of the weakness of Prussia and in November 1850, Prussia was compelled to accept certain humiliating terms by the convention of Olmutz. Prussia was compelled to break up the union of the north (composed of Hanover, Wartenburg and Bavaria) which Prussia had formed after the breakdown of Frankfurt plan.

The old confederation was revived.

Re-habilitation of Metternich :

„After the debacle of 1848 the question naturally arises in our mind as to whether Metternich triumphed or not. He no doubt tried to set back the hands of the clock, but did the revolutionaries succeed in setting right the hands of the clock ? German unification was achieved long after 1848 and through methods novel to the revolutionaries. The cause of democracy had to wait until the twenties of

the twentieth century. Metternich no doubt left Vienna in 1848 but he left it safe in the hands of Schwarzenberg. With these facts before us we should try to discover the merits of the man.

Algernon Cecil advances the following arguments in defence of Metternich: (1) Metternich was certainly instrumental in delivering Europe from the yoke of military despotism; (2) he was certainly successful in giving the war-weary nations a much-needed period of peace; (3) he was at least right in his views of what would happen were the revolutionary forces, which he studied to keep under control, ever to be unleashed; (4) Metternich claimed in his memoirs that he had a single eye to the good cause of Europe.

To these we may retort: (1) Napoleon was overthrown not by Metternich. Napoleon was a force and he was overthrown by another force—nationalism. If any persons were responsible for his downfall, then Castlereagh and Alexander I have equal if not greater claims than Metternich. Secondly for the people the transition was like that from frying pan into fire. The military despotism of a single autocrat was substituted as far as Central and Southern Europe was concerned by a joint despotism—the Holy Alliance. (2) The peace which Europe enjoyed during 1815-1848 was not due to Metternich solely. It was due as much to the efforts of Castlereagh and Canning, the sagacity of Casimir Perior, the pacific policy of Guizot and the diplomacy of Palmerston. It was also, and perhaps largely, due to the exhaus-

ted condition of the states during the long aftermath of Napoleonic wars. (3) Metternich might have had a true prespective of revolutionary anarchy, but he could not or did not realise the immense potentialities of these forces if worked out in proper ways. (4) We cannot agree with Cecil when he believes that Metternich's mission was the good cause of Europe. Metternich's sole mission was to prop up the mosaic empire. (When one cannot place much premium on the utterances of Napoleon in St. Helena or on the memoirs of Talleyrand we fail to realise how one can take Metternich's memoirs on their face value). Nothing can be far from the truth than ascribing to Metternich the altruistic motive of working for the good of Europe. Long before Lloyd George "discovered" it, Metternich found that the Habsburg Empire was a ramshackle state. His reputation can be rehabilitated by admiring the dedication of his talents for such a lost cause. His whole foreign policy, of which the alliance system was an episode, was based on this end only. In his devotion to the service of the state Metternich is second only to Bismarck, but Bismarck was a genius which Metternich was certainly not.

Mistakes of Metternich:

The claims of nationalism and liberalism, if pressed, could not be stemmed by Carlsbad Decrees, by ubiquitous police and obscurantist censors.

Metternich's ignorance and neglect of finance was equalled by his ignorance and neglect of military science and administration. His blindness to the significance of the Zollverein under Prussian presidency was significant. His ignorant vanity prevented him from seeing, the increasing importance of economic development, that in a policy of interest the economic may be the decisive consideration, that Prussia had stolen many marches on Vienna, and that in the near future the Austrianised middle and petty states would be driven to side with a Prussia they disliked rather than with a Austria they liked, in a word that the Zollverein had placed Prussia at the head of an organisation which set the dualism between Austria and Germany in sharp relief. Within ten years of his expulsion from power the Austrian treasury was bankrupt, a Russian army had been required to suppress revolution in Hungary, and the shadows of Solferino and Magenta were lengthening out to the crowning doom of Sadowa. The Metternich system pointed a plain moral; conservatism and legitimacy were identical with inefficiency. —Grant Robertson.

References:

- Ward: Germany.
- Cecil: Metternich.
- Robertson: Bismarck.
- Malleon: Life of Prince Metternich.

GROWTH OF DEMOCRACY IN BRITAIN & FRANCE

Britain in 1815:

Britain had won the war but lost the peace. She had added large and important territories, scattered throughout world to her dominions, but there was no peace at home. The situation had been complicated by the Industrial Revolution through which Britain was passing since 1760. The population had increased enormously, much to the dismay of Malthus. The miseries of the workers knew no limits and the government following a *laissez-faire* ideal desisted from interference. The government was moreover aristocratic; the majority of the people had no voice in electing the members of the parliament; the old and unrevised scheme of distribution of seats had led to the growth of "rotten" and "pocket" boroughs; and thirdly large classes of the population were excluded from political rights on account of religion. Thus though since the Glorious Revolution of 1688, Britain had been enjoying the blessings of constitutional monarchy, political power came to be monopolised by a few land-holders. The very success of Britain against Napoleon spelt ruin for the cause of democracy in Britain. The die-hard Tories pointed out that the British constitution was perfectly sound as other-

wise it could not have withstood the onslaughts of the French political experiments. The constitution came to be regarded as sacrosanct and no distinction was made between reform and revolution. But reform was badly needed in every sphere of life.

Reforms between 1815 and 1830:

At first the government grew suspicious of the radical movements and in 1819 passed the notorious Six Acts, by which personal liberties including freedom of the press were severely curtailed. But *pari passu* reforms were introduced in various departments of administration. The criminal law was reformed and the condition of the prisons was bettered. John Howard was responsible for creating a strong sympathetic public opinion for the cause of prison-reforms and ultimately the government bowed to the cause to which Howard had given his life. Huskisson made the first breach in the system of protection by introducing certain free-trade measures. But the crowning achievement was the Catholic Emancipation Law of 1829. Roman Catholics were made eligible for almost all the offices and they were entitled to vote at elections and sit in parliament. This healed an old wound in British social life. (We may also point out here that Quakers were admitted to parliament in 1833 and an act of 1858 admitted the Jews).

The Reform Act of 1832:

But all these reforms did not touch the most urgent necessity of the day. The government had remained aristocratic and neither the new mercantile classes, nor the masses had been granted any access to real power. In the House of Commons there was a large number of members sympathetic towards the unenfranchised middle class, but the House of Lords had an overwhelming majority in favour of the *ancien regime*. The reform party was led by Lord John Russel and Earl Grey, while the Tory reaction was headed by the hero of Waterloo. The news of the successful revolt against the Bourbons occasioned fresh excitement in 1830. The then premier, the Duke of Wellington with tenacity worthy of Waterloo clung fast to his colours and declared in favour of the old scheme of representation. This led to his fall and Grey formed a majority pledged to reform. The first reform bill proposed by the Whigs was defeated in 1831. Strengthened by the elections held after it, the Whigs now enjoying a strong majority in the Commons introduced a second reform bill. The House of Lords rejected it. The Whigs introduced a third bill but the Lords were still opposed. The ministry threatened to create a sufficient number of peers to outvote the diehard Tories. The King William IV, was not very sympathetic towards the Whigs. He refused to create the peers and accepted

the resignation of the Whig ministry. Wellington was again put in command. But specially after this episode Wellington was extremely unpopular with the nation and there was a chance of civil war. Wellington had to draw back. The king was now forced to send for Earl Grey and had to promise to create a sufficient number of new peers to swamp the Tories. The threat had its desired result. The Lords yielded and the bill was passed in the Lords, the diehards absenting. The Reform Bill received royal assent on June 7, 1832. It gave the borough franchise to £10 householders abolishing previous qualifications; it added copy-holders, lease-holders for lives and tenants-at-will paying over £50 per annum, to the free-holders as country voters. Thus the number of country electors in England was increased from 247 thousand to 370 thousand and the borough-electors from 188 thousand to 286 thousand; but the proportion of the electors to the population was still 1 to 22. The workmen in the city and the labourers in the country were still unenfranchised. The Act disfranchised boroughs containing less than 2000 inhabitants and boroughs containing less than 4000 inhabitants lost one of their two seats. A number of new towns which had grown important due to the Industrial Revolution was also enfranchised and additional seats were granted to larger constituencies. Thus "pocket" and "rotten" boroughs were done away with.

Significance and results of the Reform Act.

•The Reform Act indeed failed to satisfy the aspirations of the proletariat or the agricultural workers; it merely transferred power from the landed aristocracy to the merchant aristocracy and hence as far as the masses were concerned it was not a beneficent piece of legislation. It simply registered the triumph of the Bourgeoisie. But the Act is more important in its spirit and implications than in its provisions and immediate effects. The Reform Act of 1832 showed that a constitution can never be perfect or sacrosanct; and that it can be greatly changed or improved upon by peaceful methods of legislation without resorting to revolution. We cannot resist the temptation of quoting the significant words of the great critic, John Bailey: "More than any other Act of Parliament it marks the beginning of the new era in our history. It meant that the King and Parliament, hreatened with revolution, by those outside the political system, met the threat, for the first time, simply by inviting the discontented to come inside and share with them both power and responsibility. That has been our policy ever since; and it is due to it that we alone among the nations of Europe have passed the ninety years since Grey took office not only without revolution but almost without such a word as revolution being known in our current political vocabulary. And for that it is

not too much to say that the man whom we have primarily and principally to thank is the man who took the decisive step at the moment of danger." (Times Literary Supplement, March 25, 1920). The reforms of 1867, 1884, 1918 and 1928 merely completed the process started in 1832. Though it did not bring democracy to England at once, the Act of 1832 undoubtedly heralded the dawn of democracy.

The Activities of the Reformed Parliament:

The reformed Parliament undertook the herculean task of cleansing the Augean stables and naturally the thirties of the nineteenth century in England saw a plethora of reforms. Poor Law, municipality, factories, none escaped the attention of the middle class politicians. But the most significant and the most humane piece of legislation was the Slavery-Abolition Act of 1833. William Wilberforce was the pioneer of anti-slavery movement in England. In 1807 he had prevailed upon the parliament to abolish the "traffic in blood" which had helped the growth of British commercial and colonial activities. But the institution of slavery was yet recognised to be legal in the overseas possessions of Britain. By the Act of 1833, slavery was abolished throughout the British Empire; the slave-owners were paid twenty million pounds as compensation by Britain.

Chartism :

But the masses were by no means satisfied. The promises held out in 1832 had not been fulfilled. The bourgeois parliament was no more sympathetic towards the workingmen than the aristocratic parliament of the eighteenth century. The new Poor Law added insult to injury. Hence the workingmen hankered after political power. This led to the famous Chartist movement which appeared in England from 1838 to 1848. The movement fought for a charter drawn up by the workingmen. This charter demanded (1) universal suffrage, (2) vote by ballot, (3) annual parliaments, (4) abolition of property qualifications for members of parliament, (5) payment of members, and (6) equal electoral districts. The chartists held meetings and presented petitions to the parliament. Owing to discontent among the masses the movement grew in strength but the parliament was deaf to all petitions. The news of the February Revolution in France excited the chartists to a final effort. They planned to lead an enormous procession to carry another petition to parliament; determination to resort to force was also heard. The government was struck with panic and the hero of Waterloo was summoned. A large army with an auxiliary force of special constables was kept ready to meet any emergency. O'Connor at the head of a procession was to present the petition containing five million signatures. There

was a heavy rain and the sight of Wellington's special constables dampened the spirits of the demonstrators. The procession was abandoned and O'Connor marched alone into the parliament and submitted the petition. On scrutiny it was found that not more than two million signatures were appended and it was further discovered that there were a few which were obviously not genuine; among the spurious signatures were these: the Queen, Wellington and Pug Nose. Thus the movement ended in a fiasco, but the ideals for which the chartist leaders fought were not to be so easily shelved. Chartism failed because it lacked discipline and organisation and because to some extent the economic distress had been relieved by the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. But the ideals of the Chartists did not perish in the fiasco of '48. The Trade Union movement and the socialism of the later nineteenth century had their roots dug deep in the forties of the century. The British labour party rose phoenix-like over the ashes of Chartism. Except the demand for annual parliament all the Chartist demands have been acceded to.

It is time now to study the fate of democracy across the channel—in France, the home of revolution.

The Restoration in France:

The Bourbons were brought in the baggage of the allies. This was a fact sufficient to shake the throne

of any despot in a great country like France. The only chance of escape was therefore to rule in the interests of the people. But the Bourbons could not change their colour. The first king of restoration, Louis XVIII, was however not a die-hard. He had granted a charter of somewhat exceedingly liberal character. By this charter there was to be a bicameral legislature; the ministers could be impeached; there would be no taxes without the consent of the legislature; and equality before law was proclaimed, all were made equally eligible for state-offices. But there were certain very obnoxious features in the charter. The king was empowered to make necessary ordinances for the safety of the state; the suffrage was restricted and the last but not the least, the nobles were given political power. Before the Revolution, the noblesse had possessed privileges, it had not possessed political power. The constitution of 1814 had unexpectedly given it, under representative forms, the influences denied to it in the Ancien Regime.

The White Terror:

Very soon after the restoration, the Bourbon reaction started and after the episode of Hundred Days the reaction reached its climax. Marshal Ney was shot, seven thousand Bonapartists were imprisoned and persecution ensued so fierce as to earn for itself the name of the White Terror. Richelieu, the minister,

retrieved his popularity to some extent by securing the admission of France into the European Alliance and the evacuation of foreign troops (in 1818). But the next election brought the liberals to power. Decazes the soul of the new ministry determined "to royalise France and nationalise the monarchy." The principle thus enunciated was eminently sound but the delicate task of Decazes was rendered almost sacrilegious by a tragic incident. In 1820 the Duc de Berri, heir-presumptive to the Crown, was murdered and this led to a second period of Royalist reaction. The Royalists denounced the crime as the natural consequence of the culpable tenderness of the government and held Decazes responsible for it. Decazes resigned and Richelieu came back to power. But even Richelieu proved to be moderate with the Ultra-Royalists and he had to make room for Villele. Villele prohibited publication of any newspaper without royal authority and abolished trial by jury in the press cases (1822). Schools and colleges were sought to be placed under the control of the church, and an unsuccessful attempt to compensate the Emigres was made. But his most redounding achievement was the restoration of despotic government in Spain, referred to in a previous section.

Charles X :

The death of Louis XVIII and the accession of Count of Artois under the style of Charles X (1824)

gave a further impetus to reactionary movement. While Count of Artois, he had openly professed his opinions and all along been the presiding genius of the Ultra-Royalist movement. But as the lower chamber was against him he could not make much headway through constitutional means. Very soon Villele was overthrown due to growth of liberalism. The next minister Martignac proved to be hopelessly moderate to Charles. Martignac would not kowtow to the priest party, nor would he restrict the franchise. Charles regarded Martignac as a coward and declared "I would rather hew wood than be a king on the conditions of the King of England." Martignac was dismissed and Prince Polignac, a bigoted supporter of clericalism and the Ancien Regime was put in his place. Wellington wrote "With the warning of James II before him Charles X is setting up a government by priests, through priests, for priests." As the lower chamber was strongly opposed to Polignac it was dissolved. With a view to divert the attention of the people towards earning glory abroad a plan for conquering Algeria was made and an expedition was sent. But the elections of July 1830 returned the liberals by an overwhelming majority. The King and Polignac were then forced to play their last card. Four ordinances were issued by which (1) Chambers were again dissolved; (2) the electoral franchise was raised and a system of double election was devised; (3) freedom of press was abolished and (4) a number

of Ultras were nominated to the Council of State. The king was perhaps acting constitutionally as the charter undoubtedly gave him such powers. But was there really any emergency to warrant the use of such powers? In 1830 the two irreconcilable theories, the sovereignty of the king and the sovereignty of the people were brought squarely into conflict.

The Revolution of July:

The leaders of the people quickly decided the course of action. Thiers then a young journalist entered an emphatic protest against the ordinances; and the nation was called upon by Thiers, Guizot and Mignet to resist the government. On July 27, barricades were raised and the Parisians began to make attacks on the houses of ministers and on public buildings. The government ordered out the troops but the troops were inadequate to meet the situation. On the night of the 29th July the walls of Paris were placarded by Thiers with a proclamation in favour of Philippe, Duke of Orleans. Orleans assumed the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom on the 31st. Charles now realised the situation. He dismissed Polignac, withdrew the ordinances, confirmed the appointment of Orleans and abdicated in favour of the young Duc de Bordeaux. But it was too late. Charles said on a former occasion, "Concessions ruined Louis XVI." History teaches us to note—"Louis may have made them too soon:

Charles certainly made them too late." (Hearnshaw). A week later, the Duke of Orleans was proclaimed under the style of Louis Philippe, and Charles X with his family and entourage sailed for England.

The July Revolution ruined the cause of legitimism and rendered impossible the restoration of the Old Regime. It put an end to the political influence of the *parti petre* (priest party) and decided in favour of popular sovereignty as against monarchical sovereignty. In comparison with the Revolution of 1789, the movement which overthrew the Bourbons was a mere flutter on the surface. It was an episode covering only a week and was not connected with any great social change nor had it any grand political philosophy behind it. Nevertheless it delivered France from divine-right and inspired popular movements elsewhere.

Louis Philippe—His Character and Policy:

Louis Philippe was a political Janus standing midway between the past and the future. A bourgeois in form, he was a prince at heart; somewhat revolutionary by his memories he was at the same time opposed to all progress. He walked the streets of Paris alone in round hat and with an umbrella, talked and even drank with workmen and sent his sons to the public schools to associate with the sons of the bourgeoisie—a delicate complement fully appreciated by the latter. But beneath this velvet

of democratic conduct there lay a steel-glove; the descendant of Louis XIV had autocratic notions in his brain. Thiers who was instrumental in bringing him to power defined constitutional monarch as one who reigns but does not govern. But the "Citizen-king" was not prepared to accept the English interpretation of constitutional monarchy, and gravitated towards the Bourbon interpretation. Thus he ignored the fact that the July Revolution was a triumph for the principle of popular sovereignty.

Growing opposition to Louis Philippe:

Thus from the very beginning the position of Louis Philippe was full of dangers. The legitimists, the Catholics, the republicans, the socialists and the Bonapartists all cordially hated him; his only support was the bourgeoisie who formed only a minor part of the nation. The legitimists who still adhered to the Bourbons could never regard him as the rightful king of France and his policy of freeing the state from the influence of the Church naturally alienated the clericals. In the first stage of the July Revolution he had promised universal suffrage, but while the time for redemption of the pledge arrived, it was discovered that he was not prepared to go the whole hog. The electoral qualification was indeed lowered but all the lower middle classes and the workingmen were not enfranchised. The democrats and the republicans found that the ultimate outcome

of the July Revolution was a plutocracy. The sufferings of the poor were almost as intense as during the Ancien Regime, on account of the Industrial Revolution. In England the fiscal reforms of Sir Robert Peel knocked the bottom out of the chartist movement but in France the bourgeois government did nothing to allay the miseries of the poor. Socialistic ideas were circulating widely. The pusillanimous foreign policy of Louis Philippe alienated all the sections of the nation except a few traders. On account of the support given to Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, Britain and Russia became hostile. The king's plan to secure Spain for his younger son through marriage made Britain definitely hostile towards France as well as Louis Philippe. His indifference towards the revolutionaries in Italy and active support of the reactionaries in Switzerland brought discredit on him. The generation which had witnessed the military drama of the Empire now hankered after a second Napoleon. The Bonapartists were also not remaining inactive. Louis Napoleon, nephew of the Emperor made two attempts to overthrow Louis Philippe and effect a Bonapartist restoration. Though he was unsuccessful the risings exerted great influence over the minds of the people. When in 1840 the remains of Napoleon were brought from St. Helena to the Invalides, the Parisians were heard to shout "Vive l'Emperor." The Napoleonic legend was growing in strength. Thiers, the author of the

July Revolution, became a convert to Bonapartism. Guizot's (1842-48) reactionary and repressive domestic policy merely served to push the nation more and more quickly into Bonapartist camp.

The Banquets (1847-48) and the Revolution :

All the discontented parties realised that electoral reform was the first essential for good government. Even the bourgeoisie itself was offended when Guizot reduced bribery to a fine art, converted the Chamber of Deputies into a haunt of place men and made nepotism the chief feature of public service. Electoral reform provided the only means of escape from these evils. In 1847 the party of constitutional monarchy and the "dynastic Left" (the liberal and royalist middle class) began to hold public banquets to promote the cause of electoral reform. The banquets were necessary only because Guizot's press-laws had vigorously curtailed the freedom of the press. Gradually the republicans and the socialists joined the banquet movement. The banquetors drank "to the amelioration of the lot of the working classes." Lamartine predicted the fall of the monarchy. It was decided to hold an extraordinarily large banquet in Paris on February 22, 1848. The government prohibited it and the explosion came. Riots broke out in Paris. An impeachment of the ministry was proposed in the chamber. Guizot resigned. Thiers was entrusted with the formation of a ministry and was permitted to have as his colleague

Odilon Barrot, the leader of the extreme Left in the legislature. But it was too late. Not even Barrot could control the mob. In the clash between the government troops and the mob, a number of citizens were killed. This sealed the doom of Louis Philippe. He left Paris for England, abdicating in favour of his grandson. But the republic had already been proclaimed, not only by the working classes but also by the bourgeoisie.

The Second Republic:

A provisional government composed of the two irreconcilable elements, the middle class and the workers, was appointed. Louis Blanc, the great socialist writer, was the leader of the working classes. The provisional government accepted his decree that "the government of the French republic undertakes to guarantee the subsistence of the workingmen by labour and to provide labour for all citizens." National workshops were established for the unemployed. This led to an enormous drain on the resources of the new republic and the parsimonious peasants were not at all enthusiastic to feed the drones. So the elections (April) by universal suffrage of a Constituent Assembly returned a few socialists, a great number of middle class republicans and not an inconsiderable number of reactionaries. This assembly at first abolished the workshops. The workingmen rose against the government. General Cavaignac was

entrusted to crush this rebellion. After the rebellion was crushed the Constituent Assembly drew up a constitution with a President elected by universal suffrage for four years and a unicameral legislature for three years. In the presidential election (December) the factions which had combined to overthrow the July Monarchy were arrayed against one another. The bourgeois republican Cavaignac, the catholic Lamartine and the socialist Ledru-Rollin defeated each other while a fourth candidate, an adventurer with a great name, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, carried the day by appealing to nationalism. If in 1932 in an advanced country like U. S. A. many of the rank and file could have voted for Franklin Roosevelt taking him to be the great Theodore Roosevelt, we should certainly not blame the poor peasant who said, "How should I not vote for this gentleman, I whose nose was frozen at Moscow?"

Significance of the Revolution:

The second Republic brought with it universal suffrage; it introduced the presidential system; and it exhibited the fact that within the circle of republicans there were two distinct currents, one bourgeois, the other socialist; one desiring to defend the bureaucracy, the landlords, the capitalist system, the other desiring to overthrow them. (Fisher) As to whether the revolution secured any permanent benefits for the cause of democracy opinions differ; we

shall be able to form our own opinions later on while studying the fate of the Second Republic. The true significance of the revolution lies in the socialistic experiment of Louis Blanc. Though it was a failure it asked the world to recognise the cause of the "have-nots." The spirit of the decree of Louis Blanc has been accepted not only in Russia today but in conservative Britain also. Lastly, even more than the July Revolution, this revolution was responsible for inspiring popular movements elsewhere. "There is no more example in the history of the contagious quality of ideas than the sudden spread of revolutionary excitement in Europe in 1848." (Fisher) The banquets of Paris ultimately led to the overthrow of Metternich and all that he stood for.

References :

Gilbert Slater : Growth of Modern England.

Lucas Dubreton : The Restoration and the July Monarchy. (National History of France Series).

Fisher : Republican Tradition in Europe.

THE ITALIAN RISORGIMENTO

Italy in 1815:

The diplomats who settled the fate of Europe at Vienna spared no means to restore the status quo in Italy, that is, the whole Napoleonic episode was sought to be obliterated. Thus Italy was parcelled into a number of petty states. Lombardy and Venetia were given to Austria; Tuscany and Modena to dukes of Austrian royal family; Parma and Piacenza to an Austrian arch-duchess. In 1814, Pope Pius VII had come back to Rome and taken over the Papal states; in the same year Victor Emmanuel I took over Sardinia. Naples was handed over by the Congress of Vienna to Ferdinand I and Sicily was added to his kingdom. Reaction reigned supreme. Austrian provinces suffered from heavy taxation, censorship of the press and impertinence of bureaucracy. The duchies were generally under the influence of Metternich. In the Papal states the inquisition was restored; the Jesuits were allowed to return; secret societies were condemned and a centralised bureaucracy dependent upon the clergy was established. The Sardinian king was entirely under the influence of the nobles and the clergy and abolished all the reforms which had come into existence during the period of French occupation. Ferdinand I king of the Two Sicilies was the worst of the lot. He had no doubt retained some of the laws and institutions of the

French regime but he restored the hated police system, press censorship, and the ascendancy of the clergy. He made an agreement with the Papacy and entered into an alliance with the clergy to crush all liberal movements. Justice was perverted and corruption was rampant in the Neapolitan administration.

Nevertheless the pleasant recollections of the French regime could not be obliterated by diplomacy and sword. The French occupation had introduced the ideas of unity, independence and self-government and had taught the Italians the value of equality before law and freedom of opinion. Never since the fall of the Western Roman Empire Italy enjoyed any unity, and Napoleon like a magician woke the lethargic nation from the siesta of centuries. "Italy," he declared, "is one sole nation; the unity of customs, of language and literature, will in some future, more or less remote, unite all its inhabitants under one Government....Rome is the capital which some day the Italians will select." He not only foresaw this vision, he did much to achieve it. The numerous petty states under the heels of this Corsican adventurer were merged into parts of one political system; one uniform system of law and administration was forced upon the warring localities and the race of poets and merchants was compelled to wear steel helmets. It was not so easy as the Vienna diplomats thought to erase from the minds of the Italian patriots the lessons which they had learnt from the French occupation.

The Secret Societies :

Hence the restoration of the status quo meant widespread discontent and the policy of persecution merely served to drive the movement underground. Secret societies cropped up all over Italy and the most important of these was the Carbonari. The origin of this society, which derived its name and its symbolism from the trade of the charcoal burner, as Freemasonry from that of the builder, is wrapped up in uncertainty. From about 1814, it was actively working for constitutional government in opposition to Murat, the agent of Napoleon and thus it received encouragement from the party of Ferdinand. But after the restoration when Ferdinand proved to be a traitor, the Carbonari became hostile towards the Neapolitan government. It very soon spread over the whole of Italy. Its members were drawn from all classes, most numerous perhaps from the middle class among whom liberal and patriotic ideas had taken deepest root. Members of the public services of the Neapolitan government also joined it. The government to counteract its influence founded a rival society namely the Calderari or braziers, in which every miscreant who swore his loyalty to Ferdinand and the Catholic faith received a welcome. The government society however proved weaker but the chief result of the competition was that intrigue and mystery gained a greater charm than ever upon the the Italians; all confidence in the government

perished. Italian resorgimento started in an atmosphere of medieval superstitions and charms. First risings took place in 1820.

Rising of 1820-21 :

Ferdinand I, king of the Two Sicilies on his restoration had promised to respect the liberal constitution of 1812. But next year under Metternich's influence he repudiated the constitution. There was great excitement and the news of the Spanish insurrection encouraged the revolutionaries to rise. The revolt was successful. Ferdinand was compelled to grant a constitution on the Spanish model, but the Holy Alliance intervened, and Austria, with the Holy mandate to crush the revolt, restored law and order. In the meantime there took place insurrections in the north. The Piedmontese in alliance with the malcontents of Lombardy rose in an anti-Austrian movement. Victor Emmanuel resigned in favour of his brother Charles Felix. After crushing the revolt in the south, the Austrians turned northwards and crushed the northern movement. Charles Felix had to restore absolutism. Thus the first risings engineered by the Carbonari ended in a fiasco.

Henceforth three distinct movements were on foot. The first, that of Mazzini, was the most radical of these. It was a secret society anticlerical and anti-monarchical in outlook cherishing the idea of found-

ing a republic for the whole country. The second movement was engineered by the clericals who hoped to form a federation under the headship of the liberal "Pio Nono"—the popular prelate who became pope in 1846. The last movement looked to the house of Piedmont as the rallying centre. Speaking chronologically the Mazzini movement was the earliest in point of time.

Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-72):

This great Genoese leader suffered from delicate health from his boyhood but his mother, a woman of exalted character, taught her son to have faith in democracy. Even in his boyhood, Mazzini was morbidly impressed with the miseries of his country. He had a brilliant career at the university and became a Doctor of Law at the age of twentyone. He very soon inclined towards literature and became a dreamer. At twentyfour he joined the Carbonari. He found that the Carbonari had no definite programme and lofty ideals, and determined to supply the want. Henceforth the Carbonari worked with missionary zeal. In 1830 risings took place again. The papal states, Parma and Modena were the centres of conflagration. But Austria intervened and legitimacy emerged triumphant by 1831. In the meantime he was arrested and sentenced to prison for being "too fond of walking by himself at night absorbed in thought." In the prison of Savona, enjoying the

sky and the sea, "the two grandest things in nature except the Alps" and absorbed in Bible, Tacitus and Byron, the young patriot conceived the idea of "Young Italy" which was to be the soul of the risorgimento. After his release he founded in 1831 the society of Young Italy, the motto of which was "unity and independence for Italy and equality, liberty and humanity for the world". This was to be a secret society like the Carbonari, but it was not merely to be a body of conspirators, it must be a proselytising agency educating the masses. Youngmen were preferred for membership and none above forty was to be admitted. "Place youth at the head of the insurgent multitude, you know not the secret of the power hidden in these youthful hearts nor the magic influence exercised on the the masses by the voice of the youth. You will find among the young a host of apostles of the new religion,"—this was Mazzini's tribute to youth. The response was overwhelming. By 1833 the society reckoned sixty thousand members. The first aim of the society was to drive out Austria; unity, democracy and other blessings would follow as a matter of course. Mazzini was soon expelled from Piedmont. He went to Geneva and after visiting France and Corsica, he settled down in England. From England he conducted his movement with greater vigour.

"Exile during nearly the whole of his mature life, a conspirator in the eyes of all Governments,

a dreamer in the eyes of the world, Mazzini was a prophet or an evangelist among those whom his influence led to devote themselves to the one cause of their country's regeneration. No firmer faith, no nobler disinterestedness ever animated the saint or the patriot; and if in Mazzini there was also something of the visionary and the fanatic, the force with which he grasped the two vital conditions of Italian revival—the expulsion of the foreigner and the establishment of a single national Government—proves him to have been a thinker of genuine political insight. Laying the foundation of his creed deep in the moral nature of man, and constructing upon this basis a fabric not of rights but of duties, he invested the political union with the immediateness, the sanctity, and the beauty of the family life. With him to live, to think, to hope was to live, to think, to hope for Italy; and the Italy of his ideal was a republic embracing every member of the race purged of the priestcraft and the superstition which had degraded the man to the slave, indebted to itself alone for its independence, and consolidated by the reign of equal law. The rigidity, with which Mazzini adhered to his own great project in its completeness, and his impatience with any bargaining away of national rights, excluded him from the work of those practical politicians and men of expedients who in 1859 effected with the foreign aid the first step towards Italian union; but the influence of

his teaching and his organisation in preparing his countrymen for independence was immense,.....” (C. A. Fyffe).

Charles Albert and the Piedmontese School:

In 1831, Charles Felix died and his cousin Charles Albert succeeded as the King of Sardinia. He was liberal and a carbonaro, though in 1821 he had disappointed the rebels by refusing to accept their leadership, and though after his accession he had persecuted the followers of Mazzini he was intensely popular on account of his anti-Austrian outlook. Hence many moderate leaders believed that from a nationalist he might ultimately turn into a democrat. Sardinia had an efficient army with little foreign elements. Hence not unnaturally a school grew up in favour of the attainment of unity under the leadership of Piedmont.

Gioberti and the Papal party:

There were however many devout Catholics who favoured the leadership of the Pope for unity movement. Their feelings were expressed by Gioberti in 1843 in his *Moral and Political Headship of Italy*. The papal party looked to the attainment of unity by the moral force of a reformed and reforming papacy, and favoured the idea of a federation under the leadership of the pope. In 1846 when on the death of Gregory XVI, Ferretti was elected pope (much

against the wishes of Metternich) under the title of Pius IX, the papal party believed that the millenium was coming. Ferretti was a genial and kindly prelate with liberal inclination. He began his tenure with promises of reforms. His protest against Austrian occupation of Ferrara raised enthusiasm to the fever height. The rigorous censorship of the press was somewhat mitigated and the citizens were allowed to form a civic guard and a liberal constitution was granted. In the meantime Austria evacuated Ferrara when Charles Albert threatend to support the Pope.

The Revolution of 1848:

With such promising signs the pent up feelings burst in 1848. In January, insurrection broke out in Palermo which led to the restoration of the liberal constitution in Sicily. A similar constitution was granted in Tuscany and very soon Charles Albert and the Pope called parliaments in their respective states. The news of the outbreak of revolution in Vienna created fresh hopes in the minds of the Italians. The Milanese drove out the Austrians and established a republic. Venice under Mannin followed the example of Milan. Charles Albert put himself at the head of the war of liberation and declared war on Austria. He was joined by Tuscany and the papal states (April). The goal was almost achieved. But after settling the affairs at home the Habsburg Government came to measure its strength against the

revolutionaries. The Austrian general Radetzky inflicted crushing defeat upon Charles Albert at Custoza and Novara. The Pope had in the meantime repudiated the war of liberation and now the puppet princes sprang up with fresh vigour. The republic of Venice surrendered after a hard struggle. In February 1849 a republic was proclaimed in Rome and Mazzini with two others carried on the government. Louis Napoleon of France was anxious to gain the favour of the clericals and his army defeated the republicans under Garibaldi. The Pope was restored.

“With the fall of Venice all was over. The power of Austria seemed only the greater for its momentary shaking. All Italy save Piedmont, had plunged after the brief day into a darker night.....A year had withered the splendid promise that had seemed so certain of fulfilment, and one seeks the reasons for the terrible overthrow.” (Bolton King).

Character and Significance of the Revolution:

To a superficial observer the strength of the enemy and the lack of capable generals on the part of the Italians appear to be the main reasons of the debacle. But there were more potent sources of failure in the very character of the revolution. (1) The movement of 1846-49 aimed only at Independence; the idea of Unity did not loom large in the programme of the Italians. ‘The love of state-autonomy, the reluctance to be absorbed in a bigger

nation took half the force and logic out of the struggle for independence'. (King) (2) Then there were differences between Democrats and Moderates. The latter were in constant fear of socialist risings. Much time and energy were also wasted in the attempts to make up for all the long arrears of legislation. Charles Albert was also much frightened and naturally cooled by the movement in favour of republicanism. (3) We may also point to defects in Italian training. "Exclusion from political life had as its inevitable consequence, that Italians lacked the political commonsense, which only comes in a land of free institutions, that they had small sense of proportion, small sense of compromise, small capacity to measure the odds against them. It was a light, easy, picturesque side of the movement that caught the majority. They had.....too little strenuousness for the grim silent work of driving out the enemy, too little of the self-restraint and discipline that were needed to build up a rule of ordered liberty. Mazzini had taught them to rely more on enthusiasm than on organisation" (King) The lack of organisation was the main cause of ruin, though there was no lack of enthusiasm. They sincerely believed in the righteousness of the cause and fought like crusaders. Their great idealism and passionate devotedness redeemed their want of grit and common-sense and lit the movement with a light that still shines as beacon. "But they beat themselves in vain against the hard

facts of European politics and national shortcomings." (King).

The Italians however were not slow to pick up the lessons of 1848. The lessons were :

(1) Independence even if attained could not be maintained without co-ordination among the different localities. The presence of a third party made the attainment of unity more important than independence of every state. (2) There was no lack of enthusiasm or earnestness but unless these were supplemented by organisation and discipline, all the efforts were doomed to be futile. Henceforth the statesmen engaged themselves in securing efficiency in army as well as in administration. (3) A liberal Pope is a contradiction in terms. The Pope's conduct during the revolution destroyed the hope of the nationalists of the papal school. (4) The Sardinian king gave proofs of his sincerity as a nationalist and henceforth all the patriots of all parties gradually gravitated towards the House of Piedmont.

Reference :

Bolton King : A History of Italian Unity.

THE SMALLER COUNTRIES: 1815—1848.

While the democratic or nationalist movements could not achieve anything substantial in the larger countries of Europe, some of the smaller countries of Europe made much headway in political progress.

Serbia:

The state which on account of its peculiar composition was the most promising field for nationalist agitation was the Ottoman Empire. Montenegro had secured its independence towards the end of the eighteenth century. Soon after a nationalist movement started in Serbia under the leadership of Kara George, a barbarian fired with the passionate hatred of the Turks. The movement gained its object by 1830 under the leadership of Milosh Obrenovich. Serbia thus became an independent kingdom with Milosh as its hereditary prince.

Greece:

Close upon the heels of the Serbian insurrection followed the Greek revolt. The Greeks had all along enjoyed preferential treatment at the hands of their Asiatic masters. The Turk was a great fighter but not a great administrator. Hence the Greeks were permitted to enjoy in practice a considerable amount of local autonomy. Thus the tradition of the city-state was still preserved, though certainly not in all

its glory and vigour, under the Ottoman Empire. In addition to this, an important minority of the Greeks—the Phanariots—were almost in exclusive charge of the Ottoman Secretariat. Many of the Phanariots held some of the highest offices in the state. These high officials naturally secured the appointment of compatriots to subordinate posts and in this way the administration had been to a dangerously large extent Hellenised. It is affectation to suggest that these servile Greeks were inspired by national consciousness. But it may be fairly claimed that holding of high offices by those who sold away their birthright for the mess of pottage might have had something to do with the relaxation of control over the local corporations. Secondly the increasing hellenisation led to increasing incapacity of the Turks in administrative and political affairs. Even the Turkish navy was manned to a large extent by the Greeks. Thus the weakness of the Central Government and the hellenisation of the administration had enabled the Greeks to undergo a very useful political training, both in the local corporations and the secretariat. The privileges of the Orthodox Church also undermined the power of the Government. The Sultan in his relations to the Patriarch was in a more hopeless position than the English King Henry II after the murder of Becket. The parish priests kept alive the spirit of nationalism among the Greeks of the islands. The treaty of Kainarji (1774) had made Russia

•

the protector of the Greeks and thus the Greeks naturally pinned their faith on Russia. Then there was a literary renaissance which also helped to kindle the spirit of nationalism. Though ethnologically the Greeks of the nineteenth century A. C. could not trace their descent from the classical Greeks, the tradition that they were the descendants of Pericles and Alexander, Socrates and Aristotle, played much upon their imagination. Classical Greek was studied in the schools and the colloquial language was sought to be purged of its impurities and infiltrations. The awakened Greeks now dreamed not of restoring the old city states but of re-establishing the Greek^m Byzantine Empire. The recollection of an inspiring past was but the dream of a glorious future. The French Revolution with its teaching of liberty and equality thus found a favourable soil in the Ottoman Empire. Secret societies were formed to engineer national resistance to the Turks. The greatest of these was Hetairia Philike or the Society of Friends formed in 1814. Unchecked by the government, it enrolled recruits and plotted a revolution. Its object was the expulsion of the Turks and the re-establishment of the Greek Empire.

The revolt started in 1821 under the leadership of Prince Hyspanti of Moldavia. But due to the hostile attitude of Czar Alexander I, who was frightened by Metternich, the Moldavian rising collapsed. But with the Greeks it was a life and death struggle

and they would not easily own defeat. In the Morea and the islands of the *Ægean* the movement was very successful. The Turks taken unprepared were badly beaten and had to resort to savage reprisals. The Patriarch of Constantinople was murdered and a wholesale murder of the Christians in Macedonia and Asia Minor was ordered. Thus in spite of Metternich and Czar Alexander the movement evoked warm sympathies from all over Europe. "It appealed to the enthusiasm and imagination of Europe as nothing else could. The educated saw in it a revival of the ancient glories of Hellas. Patriots perceived in it a war for national independence. Liberals beheld in it a struggle for liberty and democracy. Pious Christians of every creed witnessed with deepest sympathy a modern crusade. Volunteers flocked to the Greek standard from every country of Europe. Victor Hugo praised the rebels in martial poems, and Lord Byron gave pen, fortune and life for Greek independence." The Sultan in his desperation called to his assistance Ibrahim Pasha, the son of his vassal Mehemet Ali of Egypt. Ibrahim followed a policy of 'thorough'. He occupied Crete in 1824 and crossed to the Morea where he harried, slaughtered and devastated in all directions. Soon Missolonghi fell and Athens was compelled to surrender. The Greek cause would have collapsed but for the death of Alexander I. His successor Nicholas had none of his father's mysticism; if it served his interests Nicholas

was prepared to be a conservative at home and a revolutionary abroad. The ferocities of Ibrahim also roused the feelings of the English foreign minister Canning. Canning induced Nicholas to combine with England to force an armistice on Turkey. France also joined. A joint note was despatched to Turkey, and French and British squadrons were sent to watch. On October 20, 1827, there was some altercation between the admirals of the allied fleet and the Turkish officers of the harbour of Navarino and an English boat was fired on by the Turks. The fully prepared English squadron eagerly accepted the challenge. The whole Turkish fleet was annihilated. Europe was amazed and England expressed regret for this "untoward incident" and withdrew from direct intervention. Czar Nicholas advanced single-handed against Turkey and ultimately compelled the Sultan to accept terms. By the treaty of Adrianople (1829) Russia gained many commercial and territorial advantages and Greece secured the recognition of her independence.

The final settlement of Greece was referred to a conference in London. Here the Greek frontier was ultimately fixed and a constitutional monarchy was decided for Greece. The crown was offered to and accepted by Prince Otto of Bavaria in 1832.

Switzerland:

By a contract known as the Federal Pact (1815) the Swiss cantons entered into an alliance among

themselves for the purpose of forming a federal state. The union which resulted was still a confederation rather than a federation. The central government had no effective control over the destinies of Switzerland and there was not even a permanent capital. The political institutions of the cantons varied greatly. The Pact of 1815 said nothing about the usual liberties of the press, of public meeting or of religion. In many of the cantons political power was practically monopolised by a few and religious reforms were stoutly opposed. The liberals however, gained an upper hand and carried through various civic and political reforms in many of the cantons between 1830 and 1847. This period has been called the "period of regeneration" by the grateful Swiss of the later times. The liberals also demanded a stronger central government. The cantons in which Catholics predominated were however not prepared to accept this idea. In 1845 seven Catholic cantons adopted a conservative and ultra-montane policy, wanted to secede from the federation and formed the *Sonderbund* or secession union. The Federal Diet was thus forced to resort to force to correct the recalcitrant cantons. The result was a civil war (1847). It was a war of principles between "a centralising lay policy and a cantonal sectarian policy." Though Austria supported the *Sonderbund* and Louis Philippe's government supplied arms, the liberals ultimately won. The *Sonderbund* was dissolved. By

the constitution of 1848 Switzerland was transformed into a true federal union. Thus nationalism triumphed in the ancient citadel of particularism.

[By the treaty of Paris, November 1815, Switzerland was permanently neutralised.]

Belgium:

Belgium had been tacked to Holland by the statesmen at Vienna. But Belgium was as different from Holland as chalk from cream. The people of Belgium are Catholics while the Dutch are Protestants. Belgium was, as it is still, mainly an agricultural and industrial country, while maritime enterprises like trade and colonisation form the national industry of Holland. The majority of the Belgians speak French while the Dutch language is Teutonic. Thus for Belgium, Dutch rule meant foreign rule. In fact the Dutch did nothing to allay their fears. The Belgian clericals were alienated by the government's liberal policy with regard to religion. The Dutch language was forced upon the Belgians as the official language. The Belgians though more numerous were not proportionately represented in the legislature. The administration was manned by strangers from Holland and finance was managed with a view to safe-guarding the Dutch economic interests. Thus the clericals as well as the liberals of Belgium were forced into opposition. The clergy and the revolutionary party entered into an alliance

against a government, distasteful to both, the clergy accepting the democratic principles of the revolutionary party and the revolutionary party consenting for a while to desist from its attacks upon the papacy. The July Revolution of Paris (1830) supplied the spark. On August 25, the performance of a revolutionary opera in Brussels gave the signal for the commencement of the revolt. The infection quickly spread to other towns. The Dutch troops had to withdraw after futile attempts to crush the insurrection and in October the independence of Belgium was proclaimed. The Czar and the king of Prussia had desired to intervene in the interests of the king of Holland. Austria also sympathised with Holland. Louis Philippe of France declared that he would resist such intervention. Some of the Belgian leaders wanted to have Louis Philippe's son, Duke of Namours as their king. Louis Philippe in order to gain the confidence of Britain refused to allow his son to receive the crown. So complete an understanding was arrived at between France and Britain that all fears of an armed intervention on behalf of the king of Holland passed away. Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg was elected king of Belgium. Regarding the settlement of Belgian frontiers, specially the Dutch rights over Luxemburg there were a few wars between Belgium and Holland. The issues were ultimately settled by the treaty of London 1839. The treaty of London

is famous for defining the international status of Belgium. Belgium was permanently neutralised, that is, Belgium was not to join any war and the Great Powers—Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, Russia,—undertook to respect the integrity and neutrality of Belgium.

Poland:

The real cause of the Czar's non-intervention in Belgium was not however the threat of resistance by Louis Philippe backed by Palmerston. The Czar was pre-occupied with an insurrection in Poland.

Czar Alexander had received Poland as a separate kingdom; it was not an integral part of the Russian Empire, it was merely subject to the Czar of Russia. The liberal Czar had granted a constitution to Poland which introduced a form of parliamentary government to which there was nothing analogous within Russia proper. Poland possessed an administration and an army of its own and as long as Alexander lived the constitution had been on the whole respected. But with the accession of Nicholas a new era was ushered in. The Poles prepared to cut off all connections with Russia now represented by a die-hard autocrat. Secret societies rapidly cropped up. Czar Nicholas began to rule with a heavy hand and unconstitutionally interfered in the affairs of Poland. During the last phase of the Greek war of independence when Russia fought single-handed

against Turkey plans for an outbreak had been made. But fortunately for Russia this opportune moment was passed over by the Polish leaders. The French revolution of 1830 kindled an untimely flame. "The memory of Napoleon's campaigns (1807) and the wild voices of French democracy filled the patriots of Warsaw with vain hopes of a military union with Western liberalism, and overpowered the counsels of men who understood the state of Europe better." (Fyffe). Revolt broke out on November 29, 1830. The Polish army was particularly infected and was the first to raise the standard of revolt. The Polish moderates, the Whites, opened negotiations with Nicholas in the hope of bringing about a peaceful settlement. But Nicholas was not prepared to kowtow to the moderates even. The extremists, the Reds, soon gained the upper hand. Nicholas was dethroned and Poland was declared independent. In the meantime Russia had fully prepared herself to measure her strength against Poland. Though the people of France and Britain sympathised with the Poles, neither country sent any help. Prussia on the other hand supplied troops and provisions to the Czar. Russian army under Diebitsch invaded Poland with 120 thousand men in February 1831. The Poles fought with extra-ordinary energy and valour but due to lack of discipline they were ultimately defeated. The Polish resistance was from the very first weakened by the quarrel between the Reds and

the Whites. By the end of 1831 the re-conquest was complete.

The revolt had been rashly begun and unwisely conducted, its results were fatal. The constitution of Poland was abolished and Poland became a province of the Russian Empire. Rebels were generally drafted into remote Russian regiments, if not banished to Siberia. Every attempt was made to Russianise the Poles. ,

References :

Marriot: Eastern Question.

Fyffe: A History of Modern Europe.

Seignobos: A Political History of Contemporary Europe.

THE SECOND REPUBLIC AND THE SECOND EMPIRE

Louis Napoleon Bonaparte (1808-73)

Born in 1808 and son of Louis Bonaparte then king of Holland, the President of the Second French Republic was perfectly equipped for the romantic role of an adventurer. Exiled from France along with all Bonapartes by Ultra-Royalists in 1816 he passed his youth in Switzerland, Savoy and Southern Germany. In Switzerland he received a sound military education which was later supplemented by a literary education in Italy. Constantly reminded by his mother that he was the inheritor of a great name he gradually nursed a feeling that his mission in life was to revive the Bonapartist tradition. When in 1832 Napoleon's son died, he became the chief of the house at the age of 24. During the reign of Louis Philippe, he steadily played upon the feelings of the French people, knowing fully well that they had still a soft corner for the Emperor who had won laurels for France and who had died a martyr's death in the tiny island of St. Helena. In a series of writings Louis Napoleon set forth the Napoleonic ideals as he conceived them to be. He maintained that Bonapartism meant a perfect commingling of liberty and Caesarism. Finding that the French nation was generally cherishing the Napoleonic legend he made

two premature attempts to seize power. His attempt of 1836 (Strassburg) ended in his exile to America. He however managed to return to Europe very soon. When in 1840 the bones of the Emperor were brought back from St. Helena to repose in the Invalides Louis Napoleon made another attempt at Boulogne. This also ended in a fiasco and he was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. He remained a prisoner for six years, after which he escaped to England. During this period of captivity he added a mild sort of socialism to his political creed. He cleverly realised that Louis Philippe's government existed in the interest of the bourgeoisie and that it had lost the sympathy of the working classes. Hence he planned to gain the support of the have-nots. He corresponded with Louis Blanc the Socialist and Proudhon the Anarchist. In 1844 he wrote a book conveying his latest promises. This was the Extinction of Pauperism. "The triumph of Christianity abolished slavery; the triumph of the French Revolution abolished serfdom; the triumph of democracy will abolish pauperism." Here was a Messiah who seemed to deliver the downtrodden masses from the middleclass government of Louis Philippe. Two years later he escaped from prison and went over to England. The revolution of 1848 offered him the final opportunity. In December 1848, he was elected President (see the previous section on France).

The Coup d'Etat and the Establishment of the Empire:

From the moment of his election Louis Napoleon steadily worked for the revival of the Empire and ingeniously pandered to the tastes of various classes. His soldiers crushed the Roman Republic in 1849 and secured the restoration of Pope Pius IX (see section on Italian Risorgimento) the clericals were gratified and the French soldiers felt that they had earned glory for France. The peasants were hypnotised by the magic of his name. The Assembly was frightened by the fearful recollections of the terror caused by the workingmen in June 1848 (see previous section on France). The Assembly committed suicide by abolishing universal suffrage with a view to curtailing the powers of the workingmen. But even this moderate assembly very soon came into collision with the President. Frustrated in wrecking the democratic constitution through constitutional means, Louis Napoleon resorted to a coup d'etat. The 2nd of December, 1851, anniversary of the coronation of Napoleon I and the battle of Austerlitz, was chosen as the fateful day. The leading republicans and socialists were suddenly arrested; troops were posted to crush resistance in Paris where barricades were raised. Paris was cowed and the whole country followed suit. Louis Napoleon appealed to the nation. By an overwhelming majority the nation

permitted him to remodel the constitution as he liked. Though force and fraud played a large part in this plebiscite, it was evident that a large portion of the nation was willing to try again the experiment of a Napoleon. By the new constitution, the President's term of office was prolonged for ten years; ministers were made responsible to the President; nominated *bloc* predominated the new legislature. Caesarism had come though not officially declared. The President restored the Napoleonic Eagles to the French standard, took up his residence in the Tuilleries, held frequent reviews and lavished honours and gifts on the troops. He was often hailed with the shout of *Vive l'Empereur*. Towards the end of 1852 in his provincial tours, and at Bordeaux specially, he made no secret that the Empire was to be revived. He uttered these significant words when distributing the Eagles, "Take your new standards not as a threat to the outer world, but as a symbol of your independence and the memorial of a heroic age." At Bordeaux he conjured up the vision of an Empire in the following oration:

"I would conquer, for the sake of religion, morality, and material ease, that portion of the population, still very numerous, which, in the midst of a country of faith and belief, hardly knows the precepts of Christ which in the midst of the most fertile country of the world, is hardly able to enjoy the primary necessities of life. We have immense

uncultivated districts to bring under cultivation, roads to open, harbours to construct, rivers to render navigable, canals to finish and our network of railways to bring to completion.....This is what I understand by the empire, if the empire is to be re-established. These are the conquests which I contemplate, and all of you who surround me, who, like myself, wish the good of our common country, you are my soldiers.A spirit of distrust leads certain persons to say that the Empire means war. I say the empire means peace. Your inheritance is glory, not war." A plebiscite in November 1852 pronounced for the transformation of the Presidency into an hereditary Empire and on the 2nd December 1852, the new Emperor was proclaimed as Napoleon III. In 1853 he married a young Spanish lady of noble birth and of remarkable beauty, Mlle. Eugenie. The Tuilleries immediately became the centre of a court life.

The Character of the Second Empire:

The history of the Second Empire falls into two periods: the period from 1852 to 1860, a period of unlimited autocracy and that from 1860 to 1870, a period of growing liberalism. The constitution of the Empire was mainly designed to deceive the French people into thinking that they enjoyed self-government. The principle of universal suffrage was preserved, but was ingeniously rendered incapable of doing any harm to the autocrat. There

was a Legislative Body and there was a Senate, but they had little real power. The government was highly centralised and local bodies were practically powerless. A crusade of persecution was launched against republicans and other radicals. Press offences were summarily dealt with in a police court without trial by jury. The liberty of the subject was unduly restricted and a corps of spies constantly terrorised the people. Professors of Paris were compelled to take an oath of allegiance to the government. The professorships of history and philosophy were suppressed. In these dark days, scholars and literateurs kept burning the flame of liberty within and outside France. Victor Hugo from his exile hurled thunders upon the new despotism and Tocqueville brought his scholarly life to a beautiful close by composing the *Ancien Regime and the Revolution*, a work full of suggestions though unfinished. A critic with foresight made this significant statement in 1853: "Nothing like persecution for making thought work up to the height of its power and eliciting all its value. The spouters are silenced, but when street music is stopped there is a chance for artists."

The government however sought to embalm the body while attempting to kill the soul.

Economic development under the Autocratic Empire :

"The Emperor was no incorrigible conservative like Metternich, but a very modern man anxious

that his reign should be memorable for works of utility, of improvement" (Hazen). Trade, industry, railways, public works and finance, nothing escaped the attention of this new Napoleon: He knew that the support of the bourgeoisie could only be purchased through material development of the country. "While his victims, Victor Hugo at their head, denounced him as a tyrant, his co-workers considered him the Messiah of an age of labour and prosperity. The charm was working." (Bourgeois). In 1852, was established the famous land mortgage bank—Credit Foncier. Along with it was also established the Societe Generale de Credit Mobilier, which was a joint-stock bank meant to finance great commercial undertakings. The operations of the Bank of France were extended to lend money on securities. With the aid of these new resources, the French railway system was carried to completion. Postal and telegraphic services were greatly extended. The industry and commerce received an unforeseen fillip and very soon the Paris Stock-Exchange took rank in the world by the side of the Lombard Street. Manufactures developed speedily and newer avenues of employment became available to the labourers throughout the country. The Emperor, who while a prisoner at Ham wrote the Extinction of Pauperism, did not spare any opportunity of proving his bonafide. Measures were taken to restrict the price of bread. Usury was controlled. Mutual Aid Societies

for the benefit of workingmen were established, convalescent homes were instituted. Conciliation Boards were established to settle disputes between masters and wage-earners. Thus the masses as well as the classes benefited from the economic and social measures of the autocratic empire. The whole country was undergoing a complete transformation due to various projects of public works launched by the government. Canals, roads, docks and buildings were constructed in large numbers. Nowhere was the work conceived on so large a scale or carried out so methodically as in the capital. The Emperor was determined "to make Paris the unique city of the world, the metropolis of Europe." This involved nothing less than the destruction of hundreds of houses and the construction of vast avenues in place of narrow streets and unhealthy alleys. "The Government scored twice in this process; first, in doing away with an entangled labyrinth of lanes, very useful to conspirators and for barricades, and substituting wide spaces to serve the operations of the army of order in case of a riot; and secondly, in providing work for the labourer, air and luxury for commercial men and bourgeois, satisfaction to the national pride, and noble vistas for the people generally." (Bourgeois). Haussmann, a prefect of initiative and action was placed in charge of the scheme of reconstructing Paris. Haussmann had no love for economy and spent lavishly to transform Paris. Perhaps no city-

improvement organization had ever been so audacious in the use of spade and purse alike. Huge boulevards, beautiful parks, central markets and splendid buildings were constructed and Paris developed into 'a city of trade, luxury and pleasure.' In 1855, a great international exposition was held in Paris. It attracted thousands of visitors and the nation felt pride in exhibiting to strangers the progress that had been made.

Foreign policy from 1850 to 1860:

"L'Empire c'est la paix"—was the thesis of Napoleon's speech at Bordeaux (1852). Within a year this profession proved to be false. Napoleon III was not a Jingo but his alliance with the Catholic church required some substantial proof of his concern for the prestige of the Catholics. The French church had an obsolete right over the Holy Places, a right which was more of antiquarian interest than a live issue in the French foreign policy until 1849. The Greek church put counter claims and this ultimately involved Napoleon in a quarrel in which he found himself arrayed with Turkey and Britain against Russia. We shall learn the details of this conflict later on (see sections on Russia and the Near East). The result was the Crimean war. Russia was humiliated and Napoleon III felt that he had avenged the insult meted out to his great uncle in 1812. At the Congress of Paris (1856) where the peace terms were settled Napoleon III was recognised to be the

most important personality. Though France did not gain any material advantage, she secured permanently an honourable place in the family of nations. "The result was above all a pledge of vitality given to the Napoleonic dynasty by the war in the East, or rather by the peace of Paris, at the precise moment in which the Empress Eugenie presented the Emperor with a son and the Prime Ministers of European courts crowded round the cradle with congratulations and sympathetic homage." (Bourgeois). But very soon Napoleon was to incur the displeasure of the Catholics. His German education had made him sympathetic towards the idea of nationality. Thus he was easily attracted to the aspirations of Italy where also he had received his education. He entered into a conspiracy with Sardinia to drive Austria out of Italy, but due to the cries of the ultra-montane party in France and hostile attitude of Prussia, he could not carry the war to a finish. Sardinia could annex only Lombardy. (For details, see section on Italian Unification). This made Napoleon unpopular with the Italian nationalists, while the suspicions of the clericals in France were not permanently removed. Henceforth his home policy had to be moulded with reference to foreign affairs.

Transformation of the Empire:

The hostility of the Catholics, roused by the attacks on the temporal power of the Pope, made

Napoleon resort to an understanding with the liberals. His health was also not at all in a flourishing state. The burden of absolute government weighed heavily upon his health "There are moments" he once whispered to a friend, "when I feel a century old." "This weariness suggested the possibility of his taking the nation into partnership, and inducing it to become at need the guardian of his dynasty." (Bourgeois) Hence from 1860, was launched the process of gradually transforming the Empire into a liberal organisation. On November 24, 1860 he issued a decree authorising the Senate and the Legislative Body to criticise the Annual Address from the throne and directing that ministers without portfolios were to attend both the chambers to carry on the discussion, and finally that a report of the debates to be published officially. Proudhon remarked, "The Empire has made a wheel to the Left." On December 5, 1860, the Emperor surprised the prefects by a circular inviting them to work for a reconciliation of the parties. Henceforth elections were not to be interfered with by the prefects. In the same year the Empire entered into a commercial treaty with Britain on the basis of reciprocal free trade. This treaty known as the Cobden Treaty threw open the English market to the wines, fruits and wheat of France, while it brought in the products of English manufacture, clothing and machineries at cheaper prices. Thus this was a real boon to the nation, specially with the rural part of it.

The Emperor was confident that he had won the hearts of his people. The left wing of the Opposition was however not in the least soothed by these sops. In the election of 1863, seventeen republicans were returned with Thiers at their head, who said plainly, "I am the enemy of the Empire and the emperor, but within the limits laid down by the constitution." The Emperor had to dismiss diehard conservatives from the ministry and bring in a few moderates. The Opposition, specially the republican element in it, could not be satisfied. In 1864, the labourers were given the right to strike or to combine on condition that they must not resort to violence or any illegitimate manœuvres. Due to rapid spread of socialistic ideas this measure far from satisfying the proletariat, merely supplied them with a handle to worry the government further. The French workingmen entered into "the International Association of Workingmen," (now called the First International), in 1864. The working class turned towards the younger men of the Opposition who were inspired with a spirit of revanche against the author of the Coup d'état. The Emperor was however forced to flirt further with the Opposition due to the loss of prestige on account of his bungling foreign policy. (See details in the next subsection). By a decree of January 1867, the right of interpellation was granted. Next year, a law was passed liberating the press from various restrictions. Another law was also passed permitting the right of

holding meetings under certain conditions. All these measures merely emboldened the radicals. New journals came into being and they did not know moderation in criticising the government. "By means of these journals the masses of workingmen recovered the habit of reading, pondering and discussing." (Bourgeois) Public meetings were held and the propaganda of republican and socialist doctrines were carried on more effectively on the platforms than on print. On December 3, 1860, a pilgrimage was undertaken to the tomb of the deputy Baudin, who had been shot during the Coup d'état. Subscriptions were collected for erecting a monument to the memory of Baudin. The leaders of this movement were prosecuted in the court. This gave chance to a young lawyer, Leon Gambetta, to ventilate the feelings of the people. Gambetta lost the case, but he had managed to put in the following statements in his defence:

"Listen you, who for seventeen years have been absolute master of France. The thing that characterises you best, because it is evidence of your own remorse, is the fact that you have never dared to say: 'We will place among the solemn festivals of France, we will celebrate as a national anniversary the second of December.' ... Well! this anniversary we will take for ourselves; we will observe it always, always without fail; every year it shall be the anniversary of our dead, until the day when the country, having become master itself once more,

shall impose upon you, the great national expiation, in the name of liberty, equality and fraternity." The Emperor was in a dilemma as to the further course of action, whether he should cry a halt or move on with his process of liberalising the Empire. The election of 1869 indicated that the nation wanted further reforms. Weakened by illness, discredited by his mismanagement of the foreign affairs and anxious for the safety of his throne, the Emperor granted far-reaching constitutional concessions. (September 6, 1869). The Legislative Body was granted initiative in legislation, the right to vote the budget and the right to elect its own president. The Senate was deprived of its powers as guardian of the constitution and remained a law-making chamber simply. The ministers were to be held responsible to the Legislative Body, though the Emperor retained the right of selecting the ministers. The Opposition was however not satisfied. The Emperor could feel the pulse of the nation and invited the people to vote on this proposition: "The French nation approves the liberal reforms made since 1860." In spite of the propaganda of the republicans the government won at the polls. Bonapartism could not be assailed by force of arguments as long as it knew the art of hypnotising the nation.

Foreign Policy from 1860:

While at home the Emperor sought to secure the support of the liberals, in the conduct of his foreign

policy, he tried to make amends for his support to the Italian nationalists. In Syria the Christians were being oppressed by the Druses with the acquiescence of the Turkish government. Napoleon sent an expedition to Syria (1860) and secured the redress of the grievances of the Christians. About the same time a republican and anti-clerical revolution took place in Mexico. The new government of Mexico refused to undertake the financial obligations of the old government. This affected the merchants of France, England and Spain. A joint expedition was sent out in December 1864 to bring the new government to reason. Napoleon had however planned to restore the clerical party to power and he found in Archduke Maximilian a suitable candidate for the throne of Mexico. As soon as the intentions of Napoleon were discovered, England and Spain withdrew. Napoleon proceeded undaunted. He was inspired by a desire to win fresh laurels across the Atlantic, a desire to establish a Latin empire with French help and a desire to build up a strong conservative and Catholic state by the side of the republican puritan state of 'Yankee pork-butchers.' If successful, he would win the loyalty of the clericals at home and would surpass his great uncle even, who met with disasters on the banks of the Nile (1798). The United States of America plunged in the civil war could not assert the Monroe doctrine. Hence the French could easily make much head-

way. The city of Mexico was occupied and Maximilian was proclaimed Emperor of Mexico. The republican party however carried on the fight. After the civil war was over, the United States asked Napoleon to withdraw his troops. The Emperor obeyed the order of the 'pork-butchers'. Maximilian, left alone, was taken by the Mexicans and shot. During the Mexican adventure, Napoleon committed another indiscretion. His ambition to support the principle of nationality and his desire to soothe the Catholics, found a suitable opportunity during the Polish rising of 1863. He sent a note of remonstrance to the Czar who threw it into the waste-paper basket. He could not do anything more. "His diplomacy had sounded a charge and then his drums beat a retreat, after a blank volley or two." His impotence was proved, but he did not yet learn to be cautious and wise. As the self-elected champion of nationalities he sympathetically watched the process of German unification. The Prussian Chancellor, Bismarck, purchased his neutrality by pointing to the bait of Belgium. (See section on German Unification). Napoleon had no idea that a strong neighbour would constitute a menace to the safety of his government and his country. When in 1866, Prussia beat Austria at Sadowa, wise people said, "It is France that has been beaten at Sadowa."

The Hohenzollern Candidature:

In 1868, Queen Isabella of Spain was dethroned. A constitutional monarchy was proposed and the throne was offered to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. Leopold was reluctant but backed by Bismarck, he accepted the offer with the approval of King William as head of the Hohenzollerns. (1870, 4th July). Napoleon was hostile to such an idea. He naturally dreaded Prussian influence in Spain. The French people also did not like the idea. Leopold withdrew his acceptance. (12th July). Bismarck, who had been managing affairs with a view to bring about a war with France, was upset. But Napoleon III mismanaged the affairs to Bismarck's favour. Cajoled by his wife and the Bonapartists the Emperor sent a fresh telegram to Benedetti, the French ambassador at Berlin to secure from the king of Prussia an assurance that he would not permit such candidature to be renewed. The Prussian king was at Ems where Benedetti met him. The king sternly refused to give an absolute promise that he would never support similar proposals. After dismissing Benedetti, the king sent to Bismarck an elaborate account of his conversation with Benedetti. Bismarck was not yet at the end of his wits. He sent to the press a curt version of the interview. To Germany, it seemed a challenge to their king; to France it was an outrage on her prestige. As Bismarck anticipated, the Ems despatch

produced on the Gallic bull the effect of a red rag. The Emperor advised by the Bonapartists and other admirers declared war against Prussia (July 14, 1870).

The Franco-German War:

Bonapartism was a spent force long before the Ems telegram was 'forged' by Bismarck (Fisher). Deserted by Russia, Austria and Italy, the Second Empire fought single-handed against Prussia, supported by all the German states. Bismarck took care to expose the designs of Napoleon regarding Belgium. Thus Britain also adopted a hostile attitude towards France. Napoleon was easily defeated and the Empire collapsed (See details in the section on German Unification).

The Third Republic:

On September 4, 1870, a republic was proclaimed and a government of National Defence was hastily formed. By the terms of the peace France lost Alsace and Lorraine and agreed to pay a huge indemnity. (See section on Latin Europe: 1870-1914).

References:

Bourgeois: Modern France.

Rene Arnaud: The Second Republic and the
Second Empire.

(National History of France
Series).

Fisher: Bonapartism.

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Victor Emmanuel II, King of Sardinia:

Humiliated at the hands of the Austrian general Radetzky, Charles Albert abdicated in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel (March, 1849). Before his abdication Albert had granted a constitution to his people. Victor Emmanuel concluded peace with Austria; but sternly resisted the temptation of securing the cancellation of war indemnity by abrogating the constitution as required by Austria. He next swore fidelity to the constitution. Thus the profligate prince at once became the hero of the nation and earned the title of Honest King. It made Piedmont the one hope of Italian liberals. Henceforth her leadership was assured. For the next ten years the history of Italy was but the history of Piedmont. In 1850 Victor Emmanuel appointed Count Camillo di Cavour to be the minister in charge of agriculture, industry and commerce, warning the other ministers thus, "He will soon rule you all; he will turn you out and be premier himself." The prophecy was fulfilled.

Count Cavour:

Born in 1810 and educated in military schools, Cavour had joined the army as an engineer but owing to his fearless profession of liberal opinions, he had to resign his commission very soon. He next diverted

his attention to the management of his estates (1831-43). These years were interspersed with frequent visits to Switzerland, France and England. England on account of her liberal constitution appealed to Cavour and the ambitious young man said, "Oh! if I were an Englishman by this time I should be something, and my name would not be wholly unknown." He regularly attended the sessions of the House of Commons whenever he was in England. In 1847, he started *Il Risorgimento*, a liberal journal and in 1848 he was returned to the first parliament of Piedmont. He was a nationalist of liberal school.

He was no saint or hero, but a perfect embodiment of common sense and tact. Though he had his ideals, he generally followed public opinion and would rarely allow himself to be drawn a step beyond what the practical opportunities of the moment would warrant. But he had no respect for fabian tactics. "Modern history," he said, "shows a tendency to the widening of political rights, to the improvement of the condition of the poor and the better distribution of wealth." He had the fanatic's faith in democratic institutions. "Italy" he said, "must make herself by means of liberty, or we must give up trying to make her." His whole philosophy was founded upon the conception of liberty. Thus he not only stood for the liberty of the press but also for the freedom of industry and commerce. Hence though eager to improve the lot of the poor he was

as sternly opposed to socialism as to protection. He applied the same principle to the problems of church and state. Thus he liked to free the church from the control of the state as he liked to free the individual's soul from the control of any particular church.

A few months before he had accepted office, one Giuseppe Siccardi with his support carried a number of laws through the parliament. By these laws ecclesiastical courts were abolished and various other privileges of the church were removed. Within a year of his appointment to the ministry of agriculture and commerce, he was also given the portfolio of finance and after another year (1852) he became the Prime Minister. He at once launched a large programme of reform—financial, military and ecclesiastic. Manufactures were encouraged and commerce stimulated by means of commercial treaties based on the principle of reciprocity. Railway lines were extended, co-operative societies were established and agricultural credit was introduced. The army was thoroughly reorganised and abuses of the church were severely dealt with. But his genius fully bloomed forth not in home affairs but in foreign diplomacy. His reforms at home were but a prelude to adventures abroad.

Cavour had discovered that independence could not be attained without foreign aid. His conviction had been confirmed when he found that with foreign aid the Pope had crushed the republic of Rome. Now

it was his plan to crush all the enemies of Italian independence with foreign aid. He found his opportunity when the Crimean War broke out. In the teeth of stern opposition he managed to send a large contingent to join England and France in Crimea. The Sardinian contingent fought bravely and the stain of Custozza and Novara was wiped out. France and England appreciated the service rendered by Sardinia. When the peace conference assembled in Paris (1856) Cavour took his seat along with the plenipotentiaries of other powers and took active part in the proceedings of the conference. He did not miss an opportunity to denounce Austria as the cause of all Italy's woes. England and France cordially supported him but the former was not prepared to go beyond "moral support". Cavour discovered that Napoleon III had not only a soft corner for Italy but also had ambitions for himself. Cavour determined to purchase Napoleon's support by paying some price for it.

The Pact of Plombieres:

In July 1858, Napoleon had come to Plombieres, a watering-place in the Vosges. Cavour had some "talks" with him. The result was an alliance between France and Piedmont to drive Austria out of Italy. Piedmont was to secure Lombardy-Venetia and a part of the Papal States, and France to get Savoy and possibly Nice. In order to raise the

‘Parvenu’ Emperor into the circle of royalty, Victor Emmanuel’s daughter Clothilde was to be given in marriage to the Emperor’s cousin, Prince Jerome Napoleon. Napoleon was prompted to risk this dangerous adventure by two motives. He had on many occasions openly professed his sympathy for the idea of nationality and his whole foreign policy was based on it. Irritated at the equivocal neutrality of Austria during the Crimean War he was not unwilling to punish the ancient enemy of the Bonapartist dynasty and secure some territorial gains at the same time.

War against Austria (1859):

Once the conspiracy was hatched, it was not difficult to discover a *casus belli*. Cavour suddenly began mobilisation much to the consternation of Austria. Austria naturally demanded immediate demobilisation. Austrian demand was accepted as an ultimatum and Cavour confidently plunged into the war. Napoleon also declared war against Austria. The allies carried everything before them. Their triumph at Magenta (June 4) led to the occupation of Milan and the next great victory of Solferino drove the Austrians back into Venetia. All Lombardy was conquered and the tidings of Sardinian victories inspired risings in Central Italy. It seemed that Venetia could be easily conquered and the Central States could also be brought into union with Sardinia.

But Napoleon suddenly called a halt and came to terms with the Emperor of Austria at Villafranca, (July 11, 1859) without consulting his ally Victor Emmanuel. The terms were that Lombardy should pass to Piedmont, that Austria should retain Venetia, that the recently deposed rulers of Tuscany and Modena should be restored and that the Italian states should form a confederation with the Pope at the top.

The Italians found that they were betrayed, that the French ally had prevented them from driving out the Austrians, that as regards the Central States the French ally had acted as the friend of despotism rather than of nationalism. The establishment of a federation with the Pope at the top was certainly a retrograde step. Cavour lost his self-control, begged Victor Emmanuel to continue the war, and when the king refused his request Cavour resigned. The king in the midst of growing excitement preserved his balance and refrained from taking any hazardous course. He accepted the terms with profound regret.

[The motives that determined Napoleon to this sudden pause in the midst of his triumph were very complex. The difficulties of the war were far greater than he expected to be or than appeared to the public. He very soon discovered that a far larger sacrifice of life would be required to drive the Austrians bag and baggage from Italy. He was not confident regarding the issue of a battle in Venetia, where Austria com-

manded enormous resources in men and arms. Therefore considerations of prestige urged him not to gamble any further. Secondly, the risings in Central Italy and the growing popularity of Sardinia made him lukewarm. He was not prepared to help the growth of a strong national kingdom as the neighbour of France. He had also to see that the clerical party in France was not offended by the attacks on the temporal power of the Pope. Moreover Prussia was mobilising troops on her western frontier. "German sentiment regarded it a betrayal of the Fatherland to look on, while a German state was being defeated by the hereditary enemy." (King).]

Annexion of the Central States:

The people of the Central States were absolutely resolved to have their own way; they were not prepared to receive back their old rulers, nor to become parts of a federation under the Pope. During the war, as has been already told, the rulers of Modena, Parma and Tuscany had been overthrown; the Pope's authority in Romagna was substituted by popular provisional government. The people had expressed their intention of entering into the kingdom of Sardinia. Victor Emmanuel had also approved of such annexation. But the armistice of Villafranca had turned the tables. But the people of these states were not prepared to accept the dictates from Villafranca. Victor Emmanuel feared intervention by Austria.

Cavour, who had resumed office on January 20, 1860, managed to purchase Napoleon's approval by agreeing to cede Savoy and Nice. On Cavour's proposal plebiscites were held in the Central States (March 11-12, 1860). The people voted in favour of annexation and Victor Emmanuel accepted the sovereignty thus offered. Plebiscites were also held in Nice and Savoy (April 1860) and Cavour managed to secure the consent of the voters.

Garibaldi, the great patriot about whom we shall discuss presently, was a native of Nice and he strongly protested against this bartering away of his birth-place and charged Cavour for making him an alien in the land of his birth. But Cavour's strong horse-sense had no respect for such sentimentalism. He did not consider it immoral to sacrifice a finger to save the whole body.

Now Venetia, the larger part of the Papal States and the kingdom of Naples remained to be won over. The credit of the next step towards unification belongs not to the statesman (Cavour), nor to the king (Victor Emmanuel), but to a soldier fired with the idea of freedom.

Giuseppe Garibaldi;

Garibaldi was born at Nice in 1807 when Mazzini was two years old. His father who was a skipper, had the ambition of educating him in the way which would qualify his son for priesthood. But Gari-

Garibaldi acquired just enough book-learning to feed his romantic and freedom-loving nature, and preferred the adventurous sailor's life. He was very soon attracted towards Mazzini and joined "Young Italy." As a soldier he proved to be an asset to his party. In 1834 he participated in the unsuccessful Savoy insurrection organised by Mazzini and was condemned to death. He however managed to escape to South America, where for the next twelve years he lived a wild roving life and where in the midst of his romantic adventures he met with Anita, a girl as high spirited, as daring and as courageous as he. Anita as his wife faithfully followed him in his dangerous occupation till death carried her away. When the news of the risings of 1848 reached him, Garibaldi returned to Italy and immediately thousands rallied round him to fight against the Austrians. After the defeat of Custoza he responded to Mazzini's call to defend the Roman republic against the French troops. It was a heroic though futile attempt. Austrians chased him as if he were a dangerous game. During this exploit Anita passed away near Ravenna. Garibaldi again disappeared from the Old World. In 1854 he again returned to Italy, bought the small island of Caprera near Sardinia and settled down as a farmer there. But he was not a spent force as the future years proved.

Garibaldi had not Cavour's wisdom nor Mazzini's high idealism. He was simply a patriot and a soldier.

In private life he was no saint. His intellectual power was small; he had "a heart of gold but the brains of an ox." His political ideas were elementary and somewhat vague. His instinct was to go straight to his point or not at all; deliberation or diplomacy were alike foreign to his nature. "His intense sympathy with every form of suffering, his eagerness to succour the oppressed, his deep reverence for Christ's teaching, that went hand in hand with a fanatical hatred of priests, made him the knight-errant of forlorn causes and downtrodden peoples. ... Though supremely brave he was no would-be martyr, but a soldier with a strong liking for victory. Like many another republican he had come to believe in Victor Emmanuel and more or less in Cavour; and though somewhat suspicious that the government did not mean business, he saw that the army and treasure of Piedmont were necessary for the war for which he fretted. He was ready to fight Austria 'with any ally even the devil himself, if the devil were anti-Austrian.' " (King) This explains his approval of acceptance of the French help. In the Austrian war of 1859 he commanded a regiment with success but his triumphant career was cut short by the armistice of Villa Franca.

Garibaldi and the Annexation of the Two Sicilies :

In April 1860, the Sicilians rose in revolt against their king Francis II of Naples. Garibaldi decided

to lead an expedition to Sicily to help the revolutionaries. He wrung from Cavour support for this plan. The diplomat played the double game of approving this filibustering expedition and at the same time disclaiming to the powers any knowledge of this affair. Garibaldi embarked with a thousand Red-shirts. With wonderful bravery, Garibaldi fought against enormous odds and won over the Neapolitan army. He proclaimed himself dictator in the name of Victor Emmanuel II (August 5, 1860). He then crossed over to Naples and easily conquered it. Here also he proclaimed himself dictator (September 1860). He now determined to attack Rome and if successful, Venetia.

Garibaldi and Rome :

Cavour realised that any attack on Rome would alienate Napoleon III and that the Pope might ultimately secure help from Austria and France. He tried to dissuade Garibaldi. But Garibaldi was deeply wounded by the bartering away of Nice, and Cavour's attempt to win over Naples before Garibaldi's arrival there. Hence though he reaffirmed his loyalty to Victor Emmanuel, he declared that he would no longer co-operate with Cavour. Cavour had not yet come to the end of his wits. He decided to intervene and occupy the Papal States. A quarrel with the Pope was picked up and the Piedmontese army defeated the Papal troops. Cavour

however took the precaution of not invading the city of Rome. By the middle of October Victor Emmanuel entered Naples at the head of his victorious troops. The Piedmontese and the Red-shirts completed the conquest of Naples. Victor Emmanuel and Garibaldi met and entered the city of Naples together. Garibaldi refused all rewards and retired to Caprera. The people of the kingdom of Naples as well as of the Marches and Umbria (the conquered portions of the Papal States) voted in favour of annexation to Piedmont.

The Kingdom of Italy:

In February 1861, an Italian parliament representing the whole country except Rome and Venetia met at Turin. The parliament passed a bill proclaiming Victor Emmanuel king of Italy "by the Grace of God and the will of the nation." It also approved Cavour's assertion: "Rome must be the capital of Italy. Without Rome for her capital, Italy cannot be definitely constituted." Cavour passed away after a few months.

Completion of the Unity:

The fate of Venetia and Rome was bound up with international politics, and the course of international politics decided whether they were to be incorporated into the kingdom of Italy or not. When in 1866 Prussia made war upon Austria the Italian kingdom

joined with Prussia. Though Italy was defeated by Austria both on land and sea, Prussia's triumph in the north secured Venetia for Italy. Rome was also annexed through the Prussian victory over the French Empire in 1870. At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, French troops had been recalled. Thus when the news of Sedan reached Italy, Italian troops entered the Papal States and occupied Rome. In the plebiscite held in October 1870, the citizens of Rome by overwhelming majority voted for incorporation with the kingdom of Italy. Thus the temporal sovereignty of the Pope came to an end. Rome became the capital of Italy in July 1871. The Quirinal became the royal palace and Victor Emmanuel entered Rome in July 1872.

Makers of Italy:

After we have narrated the story of the unification, it is interesting as well as instructive to make an estimate of the three great men who were responsible for the achievement of the ideal. The Risorgimento owed its inception to the great preacher Mazzini. He fanned to a blaze the embers of Italian nationality. Apart from questions of monarchy or republic, of federation or unity, his teaching concentrated Italian politics on the vital point of Independence. His political beliefs were to him articles of faith that admitted no questioning; he was intolerant and dogmatic and could not brook anything which

was fundamentally opposed to his philosophy of life. Thus he was a philosopher and a prophet, but never a practical statesman. "None the less he stands first among the makers of Italy. As a man of action he failed; as philosopher he was too loose a thinker to be a successful framer of a system; but as moralist, as inspirer he stands on a pinnacle where he has no rival, a prophet to Italy and to the world." (King). The movement no doubt owed its inception to the prophet but it could not be strengthened without the help of a man of action, a man who by his magnetic personality could create enthusiasm and harness it to the achievement of the ideal preached by the philosopher. Such a man was Garibaldi, a knight-errant who recalled the days of the Crusades, a soldier who refused to acknowledge defeat and a patriot who sacrificed the ordinary comforts of life for the sake of the holy mission and refused all rewards and honours for himself. None but such a hero could have roused the Italian people, as it was in the nineteenth century, to action against such formidable odds. But the days of knight-errantry had passed away with the termination of the Thirty Years' War (1648) and no cause could look for its success without diplomacy. This modern equipment of warfare was supplied by Cavour. Without Cavour the Italian nation could never have attracted the sympathies of foreign powers and without Cavour the third parties could never have been cleverly managed and

placed against each other. "Cavour," said Lord Palmerston in the British House of Commons, "left a name 'to point a moral and adorn a tale.' The moral was that a man of transcendent talent, indomitable industry, inextinguishable patriotism, could overcome difficulties which seemed insurmountable and confer the greatest, the most inestimable benefits on his country. The tale with which his memory would be associated was the most extraordinary, the most romantic in the annals of the world. A people which had seemed dead had arisen to new and vigorous life, breaking the spell which bound it and showing itself worthy of a new and splendid destiny." "The stain of dishonourable means tarnishes his memory, but he never played a double game except when it seemed an unavoidable necessity to his great goal." (King). A true liberal, he never lost faith in democracy and always worked through constitutional means. In this respect we mark a wide difference between the strategy of Cavour and that of his great contemporary who brought about the unification of Germany. Thus Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour, each served the motherland in his own way and each was indispensable for delivering her from the torments of centuries.

An unfriendly critic of Cavour, Stillman, points out several defects in his statesmanship: (1) The acceptance of foreign aid was not without its evil consequences too. Savoy and Nice had to be bartered

away and (a virgin of sixteen had to be married to a debauchee of fortythree.) In 1848 Charles Albert acting on a sound intuition refused French aid at the French price. Cavour could not resist that temptation. (2) Too quickly and too easily was Italy made. He ignored the contrast between the industrial north and agricultural south and showed very scanty respect to the local feelings of the people. In face of these facts he forced a unitary government. (Till the blood and iron regime of the Fascists the antagonism between the north and the south continued). (3) Cavour's contribution to the growth of civic ideals of the nation is practically nil. Parliamentary democracy introduced by the great liberal failed within almost fifty years of the completion of unity. The debacle should not be explained away by referring to the racial character of the Italians. Cavour was extremely suspicious of those who differed from him—Garibaldi and Crispi. This made him somewhat unpopular during his later days. Party-spirit came to dominate the public life. Republicans swelled the ranks of the socialists. (Public life was ultimately purged of party-spirit by one who crushed all opposition. Cavour's democracy has been nipped in the prime of its life by the quondam Socialist Mussolini.) ✓

Reference: Bolton King: History of Italian Unity.

THE UNIFICATION OF GERMANY —BLOOD AND IRON—

The Lessons of the Debacle of 1848:

Generally for Germany, the restoration of the old Diet in 1851 registered two decisive defeats—the defeat of the Revolution and of Prussia. Had the unification scheme of 1848 been given a fair chance it would have moulded the German mind and directed German destinies and aspirations into paths of self-development of incalculable benefit to Germany and the world. Its failure was a tragedy for Germany and for European civilisation.

The failure of the movement of 1848 is generally attributed to the academic amateurism of its authors and the quarrels between the Big Germans and the Little Germans (see section on Metternich and Central Europe). The real cause of the failure was the lack of “sanction” behind the movement. The ideals emanating from the meetings of the Deputies were badly in need of being backed by bayonets. Thus a policy of blood and iron was the sad lesson of the debacle of 1848. The German nationalists had looked to Prussia for leadership. The hostile attitude of Austria cowed the Prussian monarchy and the capitulation of Olmutz strengthened the conviction that without a policy of blood and iron Prussia would not be able to undertake the leadership. These lessons were as clear as daylight to a young Junker

(landholder) of Brandenburg, Otto von Bismarck-Schonhausen (1815-98).

Bismarck's Rise to Power:

Bismarck came of a noble family and receiving a university education at Gottingen and Berlin he entered the civil service of Prussia. But the young bureaucrat who as a university student had gained the reputation of leading the beer-drinking bouts and other escapades found his job too monotonous and left it to settle on his father's estate as a country squire (1839). His happy marriage in 1847 with the pious daughter of a Junker worked a great change in his mind. He became deeply religious and ultimately a zealous convert to Lutheran orthodoxy. As a true Christian he defended monarchy as a divine institution. For was it not said by the son of God: "Render unto Caesar what is Caesar's and unto God what is God's"? Throughout the revolutionary movements of 1848-49 he consistently championed the cause of the monarchy and scoffed at the efforts of the Frankfurt assembly. When in 1850 king Frederick William IV granted a constitution to Prussia he did not approve of it. As a member of the Prussian parliament and as one of the founders of the reactionary newspaper, *Kreuz Zeitung*, he very soon built up a conservative party pledged to the cause of the Lutheran church, Prussian monarchy and landed aristocracy. With the help of this party the king

and his ministers were successful in checkmating the liberals. In 1858, the king's brother William became regent on account of the king's imbecility and insanity. In 1861 William became king as William I. He was a man of resolute will and sound mind and as an orthodox Christian he was convinced of the divine right of monarchy. In order to transform Prussia into a Great Power he was determined to increase the army. But the parliament refused to grant the necessary expenses. As both parties were uncompromising the result was a deadlock. But king William would rather abdicate than abandon the reforms. His minister Roon advised him to appoint Bismarck as the president of the ministry (1862). Between 1851 and 1861, Bismarck had served in succession as the Prussian delegate to the Diet of Frankfurt, ambassador to St. Petersburg and also to Paris. Thus the young Junker Deputy of the Prussian parliament now came back to the head of the Government as a diplomat, well-versed in the affairs of foreign politics. Bismarck agreed to uphold the army reforms of the king, and if necessary, to perish with the sovereign rather than abandon him in his difficulties.

Blood and Iron:

Bismarck's appointment was a challenge to the Opposition and they persisted in their views of army reforms. For four years from 1862 to 1866

the conflict continued. The Lower House voted year after year against the budget; the Upper House voted for it; and the king acted as if this made it legal. Taxes were collected and military reforms were carried out. Thus though the constitution was not abolished, parliamentary life was really at an end. Bismarck boldly denied on the floor of the parliament that Prussia was to be made great by liberal and democratic processes. He bluntly proclaimed, "Not by speeches and majority-votes are the great questions of the day decided—that was the great blunder of 1848-49—but by blood and iron." The liberals bitterly denounced this philosophy of Bismarck. But the Junker of Brandenburg knew that if he could use the new army of Prussia in the service of patriotism, all opposition would be hushed. Thus a vigorous foreign policy was indispensable, not only for securing German leadership for Prussia but also for preventing revolutionary novelties at home. The first target was Denmark.

Schleswig-Holstein:

The two Danish provinces of Schleswig and Holstein had an autonomy and rights arising from an historic existence independent of Denmark. Centuries ago Schleswig and Holstein had passed under the rule of the Danish king as a consolidated duchy. The king of Denmark was not the king of the two provinces, he was the king-duke. The

relationship was entirely personal and the Danish Government had nothing to do with these territories. The laws and the political institutions of these territories were determined by the Duke in the local estates and not by the king in the Danish Riksdag. Holstein was predominantly German and Schleswig German in its southern part. Thus to the peoples of Holstein and southern Schleswig, incorporation with Denmark meant de-Germanisation and Danisation. During the year of revolution (1848) these German territories made an attempt to break away from Denmark on the plea that the succession of the heir-apparent (who was a son-in-law of the reigning house) would be in direct violation of the Salic law. The movement however failed and by the treaty of London 1852 the integrity of the Danish monarchy was guaranteed. A few years after, the Danish king Frederick VII made attempts to incorporate the Duchies. This naturally offended the feelings of the Germans everywhere. When in 1863 the new king Christian IX approved the proposal of incorporating Schleswig, German feelings were roused. Bismarck now found his opportunity. He supported the proposal of the German Diet that this measure should be revoked. The Diet had even authorised Saxony and Hanover to invade Holstein and the young Duke of Augustenburg was proclaimed the king of Schleswig-Holstein. Bismarck was careful to assume the role of an honest mediator

so that the other powers might not intervene on behalf of Denmark. When on January 14, 1864 the Diet formally denounced the treaty of 1852 and favoured the claims of the young Duke, Bismarck refused to go so far. On January 16, he persuaded Austria to sign a joint proposal to Denmark that the treaty of 1852 which also guaranteed the special claims of Germans in the Duchies, should be upheld. This proposal was in fact an ultimatum as the demands were made on pain of war and only forty-eight hours were allowed to Denmark for consideration. The Danes not complying, Prussia and Austria immediately declared war. Britain in spite of her sympathetic pronouncements in favour of Denmark could not but remain neutral. The situation had been so bungled by Britain and so skilfully managed by Bismarck that war on behalf of Denmark was war against liberal Germany. Bismarck however knew that he was not fighting on behalf of liberal Germany but on behalf of Prussia. All Germany was looking to Prussia to prevent the filching of these two limbs from the body of Germany and Bismarck could not miss this opportunity of securing the German leadership for Prussia. Secondly the strategic position of the duchies was of immense importance to the growth of Prussia. Bismarck was already planning a war against the present ally Austria, with a view to securing Schleswig-Holstein for Prussia.

The enemy in the campaign of 1864 was not Denmark, but Prussia's ally Austria. The Prussian army had a dress-rehearsal in this campaign. (Robertson).

The Danish War and its Effects:

The Prussian parliament strongly opposed Bismarck's policy and refused to grant the subsidy required. Bismarck however carried on coolly. Within a few months the joint army compelled the Danes to submit. By the treaty of Vienna (October 27, 1864) King Christian renounced all claims to the German duchies and they were handed over to Austria and Prussia. Austria and Prussia might make whatever disposition of them they chose to. It is significant that the German Diet had no share in this treaty. Schleswig and Holstein were occupied and the troops of the Diet were forced to withdraw. After many negotiations covering about eight months, Prussia and Austria entered into a convention known as the convention of Gastein (August 14, 1865). By this convention Austria was to occupy and administer Holstein and Prussia was to occupy and administer Schleswig. Austria sold to Prussia the duchy of Lauenburg and granted Prussia various rights in Holstein even. It was evident that Prussia and not Austria was the real gainer.

"The Schleswig-Holstein campaign was to Bismarck what the Polish campaign was to Gustavus Adolphus, the Silesian wars to Frederick the Great

and the Egyptian campaign to Napoleon—the apprenticeship of genius in the service of its profession.” (Robertson). True nationalists found that the much maligned policy of blood and iron at least freed the duchies from the foreign yoke, to which they had been long subjected. “An intolerable series of failures and disappointments had at last ended in victory; and a change had in consequence come over public feeling that must be regarded as an element in the sequence of events which culminated in the national triumph in 1870.” (Ward).

Rupture with Austria:

Well could Bismarck parade his achievement before the Opposition in parliament. But he could not afford to waste time in such demagogical manoeuvres. He had before him the important work of bringing about a war with Austria. Now in order that Austria might not be supported by any other power he must win the sympathy or at least secure the neutrality of the powers interested. Britain was favourably disposed towards Prussia on account of the noisy policy of the French Emperor. Moreover a school of English historians was preaching the theory of Teutonic relationship between the German and the English nations. In the case of Russia Bismarck had already used his trump-card. Czar Alexander II, too much engaged with the Nihilists, remembered with gratitude Bismarck's offer of

military aids during the Polish insurrection of 1863. In the case of France the task was the easiest. Perhaps to no contemporary statesman were the complexities of the character of Napoleon III so clear as to Bismarck. Bismarck was determined to play upon Napoleon's sentimental attachment to the principle of nationality and upon his readiness to clutch at any chance to secure a little additional territory for France. In October 1865, Bismarck secured permission from his king to visit the French Emperor at Biarritz. It is difficult to ascertain exactly the conversation between the consummate Junker statesman who had come with definite proposals and the ailing Emperor whose mind was rather a tabula rasa, except that it was still cherishing the sentiment of nationality. It appears certain that at least Napoleon was induced to give his assent to a joint attack of Prussia and Italy upon Austria. On an oral understanding that Prussia would not object to the acquisition of territorial 'compensations' by France in the neighbourhood of the eastern borders of France, the Imperial champion of nationality was rather tickled to aid the making of nations on the bait of securing territorial gains in, say, Belgium or Switzerland. Bismarck was certain that the Catholic states of the south would side with Austria. Against this opposition Bismarck negotiated in April 1866, a treaty of alliance with Italy providing that if war broke out within three months, Prussia and

Italy would co-operate against Austria and the latter should be indemnified by the cession of Venetia.

In the meantime bickerings between Austria and Prussia grew on the question of the administration of the Duchies. When in April 1866, Bismarck won over Italy, he started the process of provoking Austria onto a war with Prussia. He complained that Austria had violated the convention of Gastein by encouraging the claims of Frederick, Duke of Augustenburg. Austrian troops were expelled from Holstein by Prussia. The German Diet was however sympathetic towards Austria and it ordered a mobilisation of the federal forces against Prussia (June 14, 1866).

The Seven Weeks' war :

Prussia had no German allies of any importance. Several North German states sided with her, but these were rather insignificant. Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony and Hanover* and also the small states of Hesse-Cassel, Hesse-Darmstadt, Nassau and Baden supported Austria. But Prussia had one very important ally outside Germany. This was Italy. Hence for Austria there were two fronts, one in the North

* In 1837 on the accession of Queen Victoria, the Hanoverian crown passed to the Duke of Cumberland as an independent prince. Under the Salic law no woman could rule Hanover.

and the other in the South. The Austrian troops were badly organised and badly equipped; her finances were hopeless and her armies, being composed of different nationalities were motley hosts. The Austrian generals, selected for social rather than military qualifications, were inefficient. The Prussian army on the other hand was purely German; for years it had been perfected and well-trained; new weapons and tactics had been adopted by the Prussian war-office; and Prussia had a large war-fund. The Prussian army was directed by General von Moltke, one of the greatest generals of modern times.

As Prussia was fully prepared for the war, she could take the field at once. War began on June 16. Within three days, Prussian troops occupied Hanover, Dresden and Cassel, capitals of her three northern enemies. Within a few days all North Germany passed under the control of Prussia. Another division was in charge of South Germany. On July 25 the Bavarians were defeated. But in the meantime the Saxon army had joined the Austrian main forces under Benedek in Bohemia. The German general Moltke, who directed operations by telegraph from Berlin, ordered the Prussian divisions to concentrate with a view to invading Bohemia and crush Benedek. The rapidity of the campaign struck Europe with amazement. After the Prussian divisions had gained some preliminary victories Benedek was obliged to retreat and he encamped

in eastern Bohemia at a spot between Koniggratz and Sadowa. On July 3 the Prussians met Benedek at Koniggratz. It was a long and doubtful battle, and king William, Bismarck and Moltke took up their position on a hill whence they could view the scene. It started early in the morning. The Austrians fought hard. The Prussians up till noon could not make much headway against Austrian artillery. The arrival of the Prussian Crown-Prince after midday strengthened the Prussian side. The approach of the Crown-Prince confused the brains of some Austrian generals and they made some tactical blunders. By four o'clock the Austrians were in full retreat. Benedek was defeated; his army lost 40,000 men, while the Prussians lost about 10,000. Within a few weeks the Prussian army sighted the spires of Vienna. The Austrian defeat was partly due to the fact that a large portion of her army was engaged in Italy. The Italians had been defeated both on land and sea. But the victorious Austrian army could not be called to serve in Bohemia.

Bismarck was however not willing to impose humiliating terms on Austria. On the day after Koniggratz he had remarked: "Now is the time to restore the old friendship with Austria." The Prussian king supported by the generals resisted Bismarck. Bismarck ultimately, with the help of the Crown-Prince, managed to convince the king of a

friendly policy towards Austria. He was anticipating a war with France. Hence he resisted the temptation of humiliating Austria any further by occupying Vienna and exacting any cessions from Austria. The terms were settled by the treaty of Prague (August 23, 1866). Austria was to surrender Venetia to Italy, to pay Prussia a war indemnity and to withdraw from the German Confederation which was to be transformed into a North German Union. She also gave Prussia a free hand in Germany north of the Main. Prussia annexed the Duchies, Hanover, Nassau, Hesse-Cassel and the free city of Frankfurt, and recognised the independence of Saxony. Saxony entered into the newly formed North German Confederation.

Consequences of Koniggratz:

The treaty of Prague opened a new chapter in the history of Prussia, of Austria, of Germany and of Europe.

The first obstacle in the way of German unity was overcome. Austria was kicked out of the Fatherland bag and baggage.

Prussia emerged from the war with fresh laurels. She had not merely tightened her grip on the Rhine and consolidated the connection between Berlin and her Rhenish acquisitions of 1815, but had secured an outlet to the North Sea which was of supreme importance for the future. Kiel harbour itself was

worth a king's ransom and acquisition of Schleswig-Holstein would enable the canal from the Baltic to the North Sea—so often planned in the middle of the century—to be carried out as a Prussian enterprise. The sea-faring Germans of the Duchies would provide a splendid nucleus for the navy that would complete Prussia's ambition to be a European power on terms of equality with Britain.

The treaty was a signal triumph for Bismarck's state-craft of blood and iron. It ushered in a new era in the political thought not only of Germany but of the world at large. Koniggratz sealed the fate of German liberalism as it sealed the fate of pacific diplomacy.

The Seven Weeks' War was to the Habsburg Empire what the Crimean War was to Russia and the battle of Sedan to France. Austria relieved of her connection with Germany and Italy found it necessary to increase her strength at home, now that her influence was so reduced elsewhere. In 1867 Austria entered into a treaty of give and take with Hungary. The whole Empire was divided into two equal halves, Austria and Hungary. The Habsburg monarch was the binding link between these two halves. Each half conducted its own separate government with a separate parliament. Foreign affairs, war and finance were made common concerns and handed over to three Imperial Ministers responsible to both parliaments. Delegations from the two parliaments

supervised the work of the three joint ministers. This compromise known as the Ausgleich gained the permanent friendship of Hungary, but this was merely a reactionary move to give the Habsburg monarchy a new lease of life. The other nationalities had no say in the affairs of government. It was an alliance between the Germans and the Magyars to oppress the 'barbarians'. The oppression of the smaller nationalities was severer in Hungary. Though the Magyars were numerically in a small minority, a policy of Magyarisation was launched. This wrecked the Habsburg Empire (1918). The disaster of Koniggratz deprived Austria of the last remnants of her heritage in Italy also. This led to *Drang nach Osten*. (See section on the Eastern Question).

Bismarck, a constitutional despot:

Nothing succeeds like success, and the success of the blood and iron policy converted a large number of liberals to the side of Bismarck. His treatment of Austria showed that he was not all blood and iron. He next proceeded to secure the consent of the parliament to an indemnity bill for collecting taxes which had not been voted by the parliament. The king was convinced of the expediency of such a measure and the bill was placed before the parliament. There was a great debate on this bill. Stern and unbending radicals opposed it, but the majority

of the liberal party voted for it. The bill created a permanent split in the liberal party. A national liberal party cropped up around Bismarck. The long-standing constitutional conflict at last closed; a large proportion of the liberals rallied round the government and there was no rupture between the conservatives and Bismarck.

The Constitution of the North-German Confederation:

His next task was to devise a constitution for the North German Confederation which included all the German states north of the river Main. He first placed his draft before the Prussian government which made some amendments and when this was accepted by the governments of several states Bismarck submitted it to a constituent assembly of the North German states elected by universal suffrage (February 24, 1867). The new constitution was passed by the assembly with slight alterations. Then it was finally ratified by the states and it came into force from July 1, 1867.

This constitution provided a sort of federal government for the North German Confederation. The executive authority was vested in the President, which office was to be held by the king of Prussia. The President was to be assisted by a Federal Chancellor. The legislature was to consist of a Bundesrat and a Reichstag. The Bundesrat or the Federal Council consisted of deputies from the

constituent states. Prussia had seventeen deputies, Saxony four, Brunswick and Mecklenburg two, each of the others one, of a total of forty-three. These deputies were the nominees of the states and were not under the control of the peoples of their respective states. The Reichstag, consisting of two hundred and ninetyseven members, was elected by direct manhood suffrage. But the Reichstag enjoyed very little powers; it could vote only on proposed changes in the law and on the budget. The federal government was in charge of foreign affairs, army and war; the internal affairs of the states were left free from the control of the federal government. But every constituent state was required to maintain compulsory military service on the model of Prussia.

This constitution was a compromise between national unity and traditional particularism. The North German Confederation was not a loose organisation like the old Germanic Confederation. It was more compact and more unified. Though it made Prussia the dominant power, it introduced the principle of popular participation in the government. It held up before the South German states a model of unity and efficiency.

“Although we may smile at Treitzschke’s contemporary boast that the constitution of the North German Confederation proved the Germans to be no longer, as in the Frankfurt days, a mere people of professors, we cannot gainsay his assertion that this

constitution marked the greatest measure of political progress which the nation had hitherto accomplished. Some of its features were, no doubt, anomalous in a federal constitution. Such above all were the virtually irresistible preponderance of Prussia, and the concentration of, moral as well as nominal, all legal ministerial responsibility in the single person of the Federal Chancellor, who, could be no one else than the presiding Prussian Minister and director of foreign affairs. Other features must be accounted imperfections in any constitution based on the principle of popular representation as one of its legislative elements. But in both respects, nothing could have been made clearer by the chief builder of the work than the fact that the constitution, elastic and capable of accommodation was like the confederation for whose purposes it was built, not only capable of, but intended for, future development. And with regard to that development, that constitution itself must largely help to bridge the Main." (Ward)

Bismarck's following statement was full of promise and significance: "Let us put Germany in the saddle—there is no fear of her not knowing how to ride."

The South German States, 1866-1871:

Bismarck's genius as a statesman fully bloomed forth in his policy towards the four states south of the Main: the kingdoms of Bavaria and Wurtemberg

and the grand-duchies of Baden and Hesse-Darmstadt. These were Catholic states and unlike Prussia were more or less liberal and progressive. Except in Baden where the French were particularly distrusted the peoples of these states were not eager to enter into any union under Prussia's leadership. Bismarck fully realised it and desisted from any attempt to penalise them for assisting Austria in the last war. But he took care to frighten them with apprehension of Bonapartist aggressions. He published in the press Napoleon's ambitions with regard to the Rhenish territories. The Southern states were thus easily won over. Alarmed by Napoleon's ambitions they entered into secret treaties of defensive alliance with Prussia, whereby if any of the signatory powers should be attacked by a foreign power the others should come to the assistance of the party attacked (1866, August). He next proceeded to tighten the bonds of economic unity between the north and the south. A Zoll-parlament (customs parliament) was established in 1867, in which members, elected by universal suffrage from the Southern states, met with the representatives of the north, to manage trade and commercial affairs of the whole of Germany. The obvious commercial advantages, gained from this new arrangement, gradually converted the Southern states to the creed of nationalism. Bismarck was now convinced that the sentiment could be fully utilised by provoking a war with France. This conflict was,

fortunately for Bismarck, provoked by the blundering diplomacy of the Second French Empire.

Why war with France was necessary :

The maintenance of the French Empire and the Imperial dynasty on the throne was Napoleon's task as the completion of German unification was Bismarck's. For Napoleon the tragedy was summed up in the impossibility of refusing war if it was thrust upon him, since that meant ruin for the prestige and longevity of his dynasty.

Both south and north Germany could be united only in a crusade against the age-long enemy and oppressor of German peoples. In a war against the country of Richelieu, Mazarin, Louis XIV and Napoleon I north Germany could confidently rely upon the support of the south.

Even if Germany could be united without resorting to blood and iron the existence of a Bonapartist Government might spell ruin to such experiment. Therefore the destruction of Bonapartism was a painful necessity for securing the permanence of German unity.

Franco-German Relations (1866-70):

'It is France that is beaten at Sadowa' was the remark of Thiers on the outcome of the Austro-Prussian conflict. This remark was really sad, coming, as it was, from one who was not an imperia-

list. Nevertheless the fact remains, that all the parties in France felt that the peace of Prague indicated the diminution of the authority and importance of France. France suddenly realised that Prussia without any aid from France had suddenly become a great power. "It was felt that in the ground of old Europe something had been broken. Like the Athenians, after Philip of Macedon's conquest of Elatea, they had no dead to keep, yet they divined by instinct the loss of their pre-eminence; without having fought they were oppressed by the sensation of defeat." (M. de la Gorce). France was determined to retrieve this 'loss' of pre-eminence. Napoleon became the focus of this national feeling.

In 1866, Napoleon demanded Rhenish, Bavaria and Hesse as compensations for his attitude during the Austro-Prussian war. Bismarck bluntly refused and by publishing the demand aroused a strong feeling against France in Southern Germany. As a result Bavaria became friendly towards Prussia. Napoleon next proposed that Prussia should help him to get Belgium. Bismarck turned a deaf ear, while taking care to preserve the document containing that proposal. In 1867 Napoleon made a strenuous effort to secure Luxembourg. The grand-duchy of Luxembourg was held by the king of Holland as its sovereign. But Luxembourg had been a member of the German Confederation until 1866 and was garrisoned by Prussian soldiers. Napoleon persu-

aded the Dutch king to sell Luxemburg. Bismarck interposed and threatened the Dutch king with war. The Dutch king withdrew. The question was referred to a conference of powers in London. Luxemburg was declared a neutral territory under the sovereignty of the king of Holland ; the fortifications of Luxemburg were demolished and the Prussian garrison withdrew. This episode revealed Napoleon's land-grabbing ambitions and Bismarck's disinterested attitude.

Frustrated in his designs Napoleon engaged himself "in catching at straws or sending up bubbles, in order, by increasing the influence of France in Europe, to soothe an irritated public at home" (Ward). Thus when in 1868 an insurrection broke out in Spain, resulting in the deposition of Queen Isabella, he perhaps believed Bismarck to be at the bottom of this movement. And when in 1869, the Spanish crown was offered to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, French feelings were exasperated. Prince Leopold was a distant relation of the Prussian king William I. According to the house-law of the Hohenzollern family all the princes were under the authority of the Prussian king as regards certain affairs, but this authority did not extend to the acceptance or refusal of a proffered foreign crown. Yet when that prince accepted the Spanish offer the French nation treated it as a move to extend Prussian hegemony over Spain. In March 1870 Prince Leo-

pold declined the offer. But Bismarck was not prepared to miss this opportunity of provoking France. His agents in Spain persuaded the Spanish ministry to renew the offer. The offer was again accepted by the Prince (July 3, 1870). The French nation denounced it as a German menace to the safety of France. The bellicose French foreign minister, Duc de Gramont declared that the French knew how to do their duty without hesitation and without weakness. Representations were made to the king of Prussia for asking Prince Leopold to withdraw. On July 12, Europe learnt that the prince had revoked his acceptance. Europe believed that the business had ended peacefully and Bismarck was disappointed.

But luck had not yet deserted Bismarck. Napoleon was eager to humiliate Prussia further, so that his position at home might be strengthened. He instructed his ambassador at Berlin, Count Benedetti to secure from king William an assurance that he should never permit a Hohenzollern prince to become a candidate for the Spanish throne. Benedetti had started negotiations a few days before the revocation by Prince Leopold. After the news of the revocation was received, king William communicated the news to Benedetti and signified his approval of the prince's conduct. Pressed by Gramont, Benedetti proceeded to obtain a guarantee for the future. He asked for a fresh interview with king William. Such a demand was naturally considered to be an encroachment up-

on the sovereignty of an independent king, and against the house-law of the Hohenzollern dynasty. Hence the king refused to grant him any further audience. This episode took place at Ems, the watering place. When on July 13, Benedetti met him at the Ems railway station and again repeated the request he was politely dismissed.

The same evening Bismarck had invited General Moltke and War-Minister Roon to a dinner with him. They were all disappointed at Leopold's withdrawal. But the gloom was unexpectedly relieved when a telegram came communicating the version of the interview between Benedetti and the king. The telegram gave a faithful and unequivocal description of what had happened. Bismarck now proved that he had not yet come to the end of his wits. After consulting the military heads and assuring himself that Prussia was prepared for war, he communicated a curt summary of the despatch to the press. This curt summary conveyed the impression to the Germans that the Prussian king had been insulted by the French ambassador and to Frenchmen that Benedetti had been insulted by king William. As Bismarck anticipated this press communique had the effect of a red rag upon the Gallic bull.

The "Ems telegram" infuriated the Parisians. The war party won over the French Emperor. Thiers spoke against the folly of declaring war, but the nation was determined to take "revenge for Sadowa".

The Assembly decided in favour of war, only ten dissenting. The day on which the report of the Ems interview was received in Paris was also an important day in French National calendar. It was the fourteenth of July, the anniversary of the fall of Bastille. French nationalism was eager to measure its strength against German nationalism. Germany accepted the challenge.

Germany and the War:

To Germany, it was a deliberate challenge to test the force of her new-born national consciousness. For centuries past France has been responsible for weakening and tearing up the German nation. Now the day was come for proving that Germany would no longer allow herself to be gored by the Gallic bull. Hence the South German states found it a sacred duty to help Prussia.

German feelings with regard to France were fully expressed by Moltke in 1841 in his "The Question of the Western Frontier." There he wrote: "All the territory that France has gained on her eastern borders since the thirteenth century has been robbed from Germany; all the lands of Burgandy and Lorraine are our ancient possessions unlawfully stolen by France.... If language marks the natural borders of a nation, the whole of Rhine on its left as well as its right bank belongs to us and we are entitled to demand Alsace and Lorraine.... If France should begin a

war ... we ought not to sheathe the sword until we obtained our whole right and France paid us her whole debt."

The Resources of the Two Belligerents:

The French army was in no way fit for a war of such magnitude. Conscription was nominally in force, but the system of substitution which had been introduced in 1832 had made the army a professional force. Over-centralisation had destroyed the initiative of the men on the spot. Corruption and negligence were responsible for the lack of supplies. The transport system was characterised by a hopeless disorganisation; the railway service both as regards the lines and their working was of no use. The eastern fortresses were not properly fortified. The Emperor, who was suffering from a serious malady, ventured to undertake the chief command, and there was no spirit of teamwork among the great generals like Bazaine and MacMahon. The German army on the other hand was in every way superior to the French. A universal system of conscription was responsible for the creation of a truly national army. The German artillery was superior to the French. As in the Prussian civil service, inefficiency and lack of organisation were unknown in the German army. There was no corruption in the stores departments of the army and an effective supply of munitions was always ensured. The railways which

were more or less constructed on strategic principles were well organised and efficiently operated. The great general Moltke was in charge of the supreme command.

Just after the declaration of the war by France, Bismarck published in the Times, Napoleon's proposal for the acquisition of Belgium. Hence the then Liberal Government of England lost all sympathy for Imperial France. The king of Sardinia backed by Italians also stood aloof, on account of Napoleon's policy towards Rome. Austria remained neutral. Russia, engaged in troubles at home and accepting Bismarck's suggestion that the defeat of the French would provide her with an opportunity of repudiating some of the clauses of the treaty of Paris (1856), also remained neutral. Thus France had to fight single-handed against Prussia at the head of all Germany.

Within a fortnight the German mobilisation was complete, and on August 2, 450000 Germans started on the final stage of the "march against Louis XIV".

The Franco-German War:

• The Germans opened the campaign with a swift offensive. On August 4, Crown-Prince Frederick of Prussia routed the Army of Alsace led by MacMahon at Weissenburg. MacMahon was obliged to retreat. The Crown-Prince again routed him at Worth. The broken Army of Alsace evacuated the territory and fell back towards Chalons.

On August 18, another German army under Moltke defeated the French army under Bazaine in the battle of Gravelotte in Lorraine and shut it up in the fortress of Metz. The Crown-Prince now marched towards Paris. MacMahon, whom the Emperor Napoleon now joined, and on whom the French pinned their faith, advised rapid retreat to Paris; but the Empress Eugenie who realised that such a step would spell ruin of the dynasty wired him to go forward at once to the relief of Metz. With heavy hearts MacMahon and the Emperor moved northwards. At Sedan, almost near the Belgian border, they were caught by the Germans on September 1. The German artillery occupied the heights of Sedan and began to pour fire from all sides. Escape was impossible. On September 2, 1870 Napoleon III surrendered with 81,000 men. On September 4, a group of republicans under the leadership of Leon Gambetta proclaimed in Paris the deposition of the Bonapartes and the establishment of the Third Republic. With the collapse of the Empire, the first phase of the war was over.

The new French Government was willing to conclude peace but on account of Bismarck's demand for Alsace and Lorraine they determined to fight to the end. The Germans besieged Paris on September 19. It was a difficult task as the national feeling of France was roused, volunteers from abroad were pouring forth to the help of Republican France and

a large number of German troops were held up by the siege of Metz. On October 27, Bazaine surrendered Metz with 6000 officers, 173,000 men and 400 pieces of artillery. This was a case of positive treachery. The surrender was disastrous for France since it allowed this large German force to march against the new French army which Gambetta was raising in different provinces. Paris capitulated on January 28, 1871. On February 26, 1871, the preliminaries of a treaty were concluded between Bismarck and Thiers, the newly-elected president of the Republic. These were most reluctantly ratified by the French Assembly on March 1, and the final treaty was signed at Frankfurt on May 10, 1871.

The Treaty of Frankfurt:

France ceded to Germany Alsace (except Belfort) and eastern Lorraine, including Metz and Strassburg. An indemnity of five milliard Francs was imposed upon France. The German troops were to remain in occupation of northern France until the indemnity was wholly paid.

• “The Peace of Frankfurt had with rare coolness accomplished almost everything that the ruling political genius of the Franco-German war had set forth to achieve by it. France had been brought to her knees; and, though her power of recuperation had, as was speedily to be shown, been under-estimated by Bismarck, who, from his point of view, miscalculated

her pecuniary ransom, he had, by fulfilling Germany's historic dream, which had of late grown into a national resolve, and recovering for her Alsace and German-speaking Lorraine provided her with an efficient protection against any future attack from the west. Whether the protection thus secured was won for all time remained to be seen.....No pacification has ever been concluded which has left more open, on both sides, the sources of deadly mistrust..... But, while bringing this peace to pass, Bismarck had also achieved the German unity of which the new empire, called into life at Versailles, was the symbol and the crown. (Ward)

The New German Empire:

Just as Bismarck had expected the South Germans had fought shoulder to shoulder with the North Germans against the historic enemy of all the Germans. The fact that the great triumph of German arms had been achieved by the Southerners as well as by the Northerners, by the Catholics as well as by the Protestants, by the princes as well as by the peasants, sent a patriotic thrill throughout the Germanies. By November 1870, the four South German states entered into union with the North German Federation. Bismarck, by skilful manipulation, managed to convert even Bavaria to the idea of an empire. King William I of Prussia, who was unwilling to give up the historic title of the king of Prussia, was

ultimately persuaded to favour the title of 'German Emperor'; the expression 'Emperor of Germany' was repugnant to the Bavarian conception of sovereignty. This idea crystallised during the siege of Paris. On January 18, 1871 in the famous Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, the German Empire was proclaimed by an Imperial decree read by Bismarck to the assembly composed of King William, the German princes, the generals and the deputies from the North German Confederation. The grand-duke of Baden, then called for cheers for Emperor William.

The Results of the War:

"Few events in the world's history have had immediate results more tremendous than those that flowed from the military debacle of France which culminated in the disaster at Sedan." (Hearnshaw)

The foremost and the most immediate result was the collapse of Bonapartism. The Second Empire fell not before the radical propaganda of the students' quarter and the law courts, but before the Prussian guns. France attained her salvation in the throes of a national disaster but she had to purchase this salvation by losing Alsace and Lorraine. Since the great Revolution of 1789, the population of these territories, the majority of whom were German in race, felt pride in considering themselves French. The majority of this population were not willing to be incorporated into Germany. Hence the French always

regarded this annexation as a crime—the “tearing of children from their mother.” History proved that it was worse than a crime, it was a blunder. Bismarck however regarded this as liberating territory which had been wrested from Germany by Louis XIV at a time when Germany was weak and divided against herself. Bismarck perhaps would have been content with only a fragment of the territories actually acquired; but strategic considerations prohibited Moltke and other generals to allow this. Bismarck could not come to Berlin and face the popular German demand for French territory without laying himself open to the charge of having been weakly generous to the descendants of Louis XIV and Napoleon. Moreover the majority of the population in these territories spoke German. “Alsace and Lorraine were to all Germans unredeemed Germany; they were to German nationalism what Rome was to Italian nationalism.” (Robertson) But whatever might have been the truth in 1870-1, the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine aroused the desire of ‘revanche’ in France and another bout between France and Germany seemed inevitable.

The Franco-German war completed the unification of Germany. It was however a triumph for the questionable policy of blood and iron; it unfortunately made militarism popular not only in Germany but throughout Europe. Germany emerged from the war a great power while her historic enemy

sank into the background. "The Franco-Prussian war reversed the situation which had existed for two hundred years." (Fay) After the Thirty Years' War in the seventeenth century Germany remained weak, exhausted and divided. It was moreover the policy of France from that time onwards to keep her weak and divided. Richelieu was the author of this policy, Louis XIV and to some extent Napoleon were his true disciples. In 1870-71, by Sedan and Versailles Bismarck transformed Germany into a strong unified empire. The situation between France and Germany was now reversed; it was no longer Germany but France which was weak and in danger from an attack from across the Rhine. The republican France could not but nurse the mission of *revanche* for this humiliation.

"The completion of Italy's unification was a pendant to that of Germany." Victor Emmanuel with Bismarck's approval occupied Rome and the temporal power of the Pope came to an end. (See sections on Italian Unification and Problems of Latin Europe).

Russia with Bismarck's approval denounced the articles of the treaty of Paris (1856) which limited Russian naval forces in the Black Sea. This was ratified by the powers in March 1871.

References:

Robertson: Bismarck.

Ward: Germany.

PROBLEMS OF LATIN EUROPE (1870-1914)

[In this section we propose to deal with the problems peculiar to the Latin countries specially France and Italy.]

France in the year 1870-71:

The debacle at Sedan (Sept. 2) was immediately followed by the outbreak of revolution in Paris; the Empire collapsed like a pack of cards and the republic was proclaimed on September 4, 1870. A "Government of National Defence" was hastily set up under Gambetta, Favre and General Trochu. This provisional government tried its best to save the country, but it could not check the advance of the Germany army. Paris was besieged within a fortnight. Parisians put up a brave defence. But due to the fall of Metz (October 27), the Germans could easily concentrate on Paris. On January 28, 1871, Paris capitulated after an heroic resistance. Then negotiations were started for concluding peace. In the meantime, the people of Paris, led by radical leaders of socialistic and anarchic schools began to distrust the motives of the provisional government which was predominated by monarchists. The commune of Paris predominated by socialists rose against the provisional government which in the meantime had transferred the capital to Versailles.

The commune was in favour of a loose federation of communes as a form of government and urged for introduction of socialistic reforms. The provisional government could not stand this breach with the enemies in home and determined to crush the rebellion at any cost. Thus from the beginning of April 1871 Paris was besieged for the second time, the besiegers being this time Frenchmen and not Germans. After about six weeks the commune was crushed. The commune was the first attempt of the proletariat to govern itself, and as such it is a landmark in the history of socialism. For France however, the year 1870-71 was the Terrible Year, a year which saw a foreign invasion, a civil war and the imposition of a humiliating treaty. By the treaty of Frankfurt (May 10, 1871), France was forced to cede Alsace and a large part of Lorraine including the important fortress of Metz and she was to pay an indemnity of five thousand million francs within three years. German troops were to remain in occupation of France for these years and were to be gradually withdrawn as the instalments of indemnity were paid. Thus after 1871 France had to face two problems: the framing of a suitable constitution and liberating the country from the army of occupation.

The Constitution of 1875 :

The Second Empire fell, not before the radical propaganda of the students' quarter and the law-

courts, but before the Prussian guns. (Fisher) The war had not wiped out entirely the Bonapartist elements from the country. Though the people might have lost faith in the Bonapartist dynasty there were many who were anxious for instituting a monarchical form of government. Monarchists had predominated in the provisional government. But as the Bourbon cadet was not prepared to repudiate some of his sentiments, the monarchical cause was discredited and ultimately the republicans won. In 1875 a number of constitutional laws were passed and the constitution resulting from these laws is known as the constitution of 1875. A legislature has been established consisting of two houses: the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies, the Senate to consist of 300 members (each at least 40 years old) and chosen for 9 years, the Chamber to be elected directly by universal suffrage for a term of 4 years. Excepting the Money Bills the two houses have more or less the same powers. In practice however the Senate has been thrust into a secondary role. The head of the state, the President of the republic, is elected for a term of 7 years by the two houses meeting together. The ministers are appointed by the President. But the ministers being responsible to the legislature this right of the President is a mere formality. The President has no real powers. It has been well-said that the King of England reigns but does not govern, the President of U. S. A.

governs but does not reign, the President of France neither reigns nor governs. The constitution of 1875 which still endures has introduced a Presidential Parliamentary form of Responsible Government.

Liberation of the territory :

Thiers, who had been elected (February 17, 1871) chief of the executive of the French Republic, after concluding the treaty of Frankfurt concentrated his attention upon paying off the indemnity. A loan of two milliard francs and a half was issued in June 1871. Double this amount was offered. In July 1872, a loan of three milliard francs was issued. The sum was over subscribed ten times and more. Thus by March 1873 Thiers was able to pay up the final instalment, six months earlier than was provided by the treaty. By the autumn of 1873 Germans completed the evacuation of French soil and Thiers was deservedly acclaimed as the liberator of the fatherland. Thiers also contributed much to the military regeneration of the country. Compulsory military service on the Prussian model was introduced, a Committee of Defence was established and the eastern frontier was fortified.

The Separation of Church and State:

Another problem of first-rate importance was the problem of the church. It was however not a legacy of the Franco-German war. It was a problem which

was troubling France from the period of the Revolution. Napoleon's Concordat (1802) had long survived its utility. The problem had become more complicated due to the oscillating policy of Napoleon III towards the clericals. The republicans however had no soft corners for the clericals. There are no two things more contradictory than clericalism and democracy. This was evident during the long protracted trial of a Jewish military officer, named Alfred Dreyfus (1894-1906). Dreyfus was ultimately declared innocent of the charge of treason brought against him. But the anti-Semites were bent upon running him down. The clericals joined the anti-Semites to discredit the Republic which had taken an impartial and non-sectarian attitude. The republicans were well-disposed towards Roman catholicism and counted amongst them many pious believers, but they were determined to put an end to the powers of the clericals who were using them for the interests of papacy and monarchists. In 1901 Waldeck-Rousseau, the then premier, carried a law which required government authorisation for Roman catholic associations and which withheld recognition to associations which included foreign members. The result was that a number of religious and specially teaching orders were dissolved. By a law of 1904 all teaching by religious orders was prohibited. In 1905, Briand, the then minister of Public Worship, carried a law abrogating the Concordat of

1802. The state was henceforth not to pay the salaries of the clergy; on the other hand it relinquished all rights over their appointment. Pope Pius X denounced this legislation. In January 1907 Briand carried the crowning bill by which the ownership of the church-property was vested in the respective communes though the method of worship was not interfered with. The French Catholics "have gradually acquiesced if not in the law at any rate in the separation of Church and State as a fait accompli." (Bourgeois)

Problems of French colonial expansion and diplomacy will be dealt with later on. (See sections on the Expansion of Europe and Diplomacy: 1870-1914).

Papacy in 1870-71 :

The year 1870 was as momentous for Italy as for France. Pope Pius IX (1846-78) who was eager to revive the glory and prestige of medieval Papacy decided in 1869 to place the question of Papal Infallibility before an œcumenical council. After a long discussion it was decided to solve the question by throwing it open to the votes of the Catholic bishops from all over the Christian world. The result was in favour of Papal Infallibility and on July 8, 1870 this new dogma of Infallibility was proclaimed. But Franco-German war, which had just broken out, did not allow the Pope to reap this new harvest. Military need obliged Napoleon III to re-

call (August 19, 1870) the last French troops who since 1849 had upheld the temporal sovereignty of the Pope and when the collapse of the French Empire at Sedan made it clear that Napoleon III would never be able to support the Pope, the government of Victor Emmanuel with Bismarck's approval sent an expedition into the Papal State, and on September 20, 1870 the troops of Emmanuel occupied the Eternal City. The king took up his abode at the Quirinal. The process of unification now reached its completion. The Pope however denounced the onslaught on the temporal power of the Holy See. In May, 1871 the Italian parliament passed the Law of Guarantees embodying Cavour's ideal of a free church in a free state. By this law the Pope was recognised as a reigning sovereign. As compensation for the annexation of his estate, the Vatican and the Lateran Buildings were handed over to the Pope and a huge annual subsidy was also granted. The government renounced all authority over purely ecclesiastical affairs. The Pope supported by the French clerical party refused to recognise the new Italian government and condemned the Law of Guarantees on the ground that it was a municipal law and not an international agreement. He withdrew to the Vatican and declared himself a prisoner. He appealed to the Catholics of Italy not to take part in the governmental affairs. Thus loyalty to the church clashed with the loyalty to the state and many patriotic Italians

THE GERMAN EMPIRE: 1871-1914

The Constitution of the Empire :

The constitution of the new Empire was in the nature of permanent treaties between the North German Confederation and the four South German states, and it came into force on April 16, 1871. It was more or less an extension of the North German Confederation. The king of Prussia became the German Emperor (Deutscher Kaiser). The Kaiser was vested with the supreme direction of military and political affairs of the Empire, he was the commander-in-chief of the army and the navy, and he had the right to appoint the Imperial Chancellor. The Chancellor was responsible to the Kaiser alone. A bicameral body was in charge of the imperial legislation. The Bundesrat (Federal Council) was the upper house, composed of the delegates nominated by the rulers of the member-states. Of the sixty-one seats in the Bundesrat, Prussia alone had seventeen, Bavaria six, a few had three or four seats, and all the rest had one each. The Reichstag was composed of members returned by males over twentyfive years of age. In Reichstag also Prussia predominated having more than half of its seats. The Bundesrat was really an assembly of ambassadors, whereas the Reichstag was similar to the House of Commons in England or the House of Representatives in U.S.A. But the Reichstag had no effective control over the ministry; and

In 1931, a revolution took place in Spain. A republic was established and Alfonso, the last of the Bourbons, fled to England.

Portugal :

During the nineties of the nineteenth century the socialist movement grew up in Portugal. The government dealt with the movement with a heavy hand. Parliamentary institutions were thrust into the background. So republicanism became popular. In 1910 a successful revolution broke out in Lisbon, monarchy was overthrown and a republic was proclaimed. In 1911 a constitution was drawn up after that of the Third French Republic. It provided a bi-cameral legislature, responsible ministry and universal suffrage. In the same year the Church was separated from the State.

References :

Bourgeois : Modern France.

Recouly : The Third Republic. (National History of France series.)

King : History of Italian Unity.

Alonzo Baker : The Pope King Again. (Pacific Press Publishing Association.)

Fisher : Republican Tradition in Europe.

Seignobos : A Political History of Contemporary Europe.

tion was adopted guaranteeing individual liberties and providing a constitutional monarchy. The throne was first offered to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. On his refusal, Prince Amadeo of Savoy, second son of Victor Emmanuel of Italy, was offered the throne (1870). Owing to the opposition of the republicans and patriotic Spaniards who regarded Amadeo as a foreigner, the latter abdicated in 1873. A republic was proclaimed. The republicans however were not united on the issue of the form of the state. Some favoured a centralised state, while others under the influence of contemporary "Communism" in France favoured a federal republic. The army predominated by monarchists declared in 1874 in favour of Alfonso, son of Isabella. The republic which was recognised only by the United States fell without a struggle. Alfonso ascended the throne in 1875 as Alfonso XII. Alfonso ruled for ten years. He was a benevolent liberal king. In 1876 a new constitution was promulgated which created a responsible ministry and a bi-cameral legislature. When he died in 1885, he left an infant son. A regency ruled upto 1902, when the king attained majority and was crowned as Alfonso XIII. During his minority Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines were lost. Alfonso XIII proved to be an efficient ruler; but due to his reactionary policy during the twenties of this century he became very unpopular.

found themselves heretics in the eyes of the Pope while many loyal Catholics found themselves traitors to the country. Pope Pius X realised the critical position of the Italian Catholics and in 1905 permitted the Catholics to take a share in the political life of the country. But the breach was not fully repaired. Crispi had rightly declared: "The greatest man in the Italian state will be the man who solves the Roman Question". In 1929, Signor Mussolini, the quondam anti-clerical, repaired this breach.

Italia Irredenta :

After 1870, the Italians discovered that Italian unity was still incomplete because of the unredeemed Trent, Trieste and Dalmatia. People of Trent and Trieste spoke Italian and were in fact Italian in race. The Dalmatian coast was necessary for securing scientific or natural boundary for Italy, as the Adriatic was considered to be an inland sea as far as Italy was concerned. But as all these regions belonged to Austria, a war with Austria was indispensable. As long as Italy could not come to terms with France regarding colonial issues, Italy could not venture to measure her strength against Austria. (We shall deal with Italian diplomacy as well as Italian colonial adventures later on).

Spain :

In 1868 the despotic queen Isabella II had to face a revolution. She fled to France. A new constitu-

like the British House of Commons before the passing of the Act of 1911, its position was not clearly superior to that of Bundesrat. The two houses legislated on the imperial affairs, controlled the finances of the Empire, and dealt with the problems relating to trade and industry, transport and communications, army and navy. Matters not falling within the jurisdiction of the Empire were dealt with by the states concerned. The execution of the imperial laws was however placed not in the hands of an Imperial Civil Service, but in charge of the states directly.

The Constitution of the German Empire was at that time extolled by many (mostly, admirers of Bismarck) as a perfect mechanism in which the obviously contradictory claims had been cleverly adjusted. But from 1914 onwards this constitution has been denounced as a reactionary system with no redeeming features. The truth is perhaps that it suited Germany perfectly well in 1871. No constitution can be a perfection and the German imperial constitution did not form an exception to this. It did not secure for Germany a true type of federal government, as Prussian hegemony was ensured by allotting to her weight in the legislature. The Imperial Chancellor was no doubt left free from the control of the legislature. The Reichstag had no privileged position in the system. The Bundesrat was an instrument through which the princes could influence the affairs of the whole nation. In spite of all these defects we must

admit that this constitution gave proof of Bismarck's genius in handling the political difficulties which had long militated against national unification. Prussia had been the leader in the movement of unification and the Hohenzollern dynasty played not an insignificant part in this drama. Bismarck as a minister of Hohenzollern Prussia could not at once reject the claims of Prussia. The Chancellor could not be appointed by a legislature in which the two houses represented two different, if not hostile, orders. The justification for the Bundesrat lay in the fact that the independent princes of South Germany would never have consented to enter into a federation without such an institution. The tragedy lay in the fact that with the progress of time this constitution underwent no change. It remained as sacrosanct as the old Spartan constitution.

The Kultur Kampf:

The achievement of unity did not solve all the problems of the fatherland. The position and privileges of the Catholic church was an old problem. Under the Prussian constitution of 1850, the Catholic church enjoyed a large measure of independence. The events of the year 1870-71 created fresh issues. The southern states were Catholic and their deputies in the federal legislature were champions of the Catholic cause. The decree of Papal Infallibility of 1870 (See section on

Latin Europe) was repugnant to any sovereign state. Even many of the German Catholic bishops refused to subscribe to this dogma. The recalcitrant Catholics under the leadership of Dollinger, the famous historian, called themselves Old Catholics. The loyal Catholics demanded dismissal of Dollinger and his followers. The Prussian government refused to accede to the demand. This very soon led to a rupture between the Pope and Bismarck. Bismarck took up the gauntlet. In 1872 he inaugurated the 'war to save civilisation'—Kultur Kampf. The Jesuits were expelled from Germany in July 1872 and a series of anti-Catholic laws were passed in the month of May of each of the three succeeding years. By the law of 1873 public excommunications were forbidden, civil tribunals were authorised to deal with appeals on ecclesiastical affairs, candidates for priesthood were required to take a course in general knowledge and church appointments were to be notified to the civil authority. By the law of 1874 failure to notify church appointments was penalised. The same year compulsory civil marriage was established for the whole empire by imperial decree. The Pope declared these laws invalid. Prussia retaliated by fresh laws (1875) which led to the dissolution of all monasteries in Prussia and revoked the concessions granted in 1850. Bismarck's standpoint was absolutely modern and rational. No government can tolerate the

formation of a state within a state the encroachment upon the sovereignty of the state, and no modern government can allow any section of its subjects to pay homage to foreign authority. He rightly apprehended that the Catholic move was aimed at the destruction of the hard-earned unity. For five years the struggle continued between Bismarck and the unbending Catholics. In 1880 the Prussian parliament gave the government the right of dispensing with the laws. This was clearly an acknowledgment of defeat. Like Henry II of England, who fought with Becket for the rights of state against church and Hohenstaufen Emperor Henry IV who fought with Pope Gregory VII for similar rights, Bismarck acknowledged, or rather appeared to have acknowledged, defeat. To enforce the May Laws Bismarck had resorted to fines, imprisonment and expulsion from the country, but the Catholics had also fought with the spirit of crusaders and in the election of 1877 the Catholic parliamentary party, known as the Centre, secured the largest number of seats. At about the same time other social issues of greater importance were cropping up. In order to direct his attention exclusively to these problems Bismarck decided to retreat. Between 1880 and 1893 the laws were gradually withdrawn, but the laws concerning civil marriage and the abolition of church privileges granted in 1853 were not revoked.

It is perhaps not accurate to say that Bismarckian policy in the Kultur Kampf ended in a complete defeat. For we have to consider the following facts. The Liberals who passed and upheld the May Laws never recanted nor repented the principles underlying these laws. The new Pope Leo XIII was as tired of the struggle as Bismarck and after the May Laws were withdrawn the Centre party had instructions from the new Pope to support Bismarck in his fight against the socialists. To be plain, Bismarck deliberately sacrificed victory in the Kultur Kampf to victories more important in his judgment. (Robertson)

Only on grounds of expediency the existence of a parliamentary party organised on sectarian basis could be tolerated by a statesman of Bismarck's grit. The Centre party was dissolved by the Nazis in July 1933 and the Vatican by a concordat approved it.

Bismarck and Socialism:

Two rival socialist parties, founded by Ferdinand Lassale and Karl Marx, the Workingmen's Association and the Social Democratic Party, united into one organisation in 1875 with a view to making the socialistic agitation more formidable. The programme of the socialists included state ownership and management of the industries, privileged position for the proletariat and a free state. The strength of the united Social Democratic Party was revealed

in the elections of 1877. In 1871 only two socialist members were returned to the Reichstag. In 1874, nine were returned; in 1877 the party secured 12 seats. In official circles, as among the landholding and mercantile classes generally, the triumphs of the movement were viewed with alarm. It was an open secret that the socialists were opposed to the idea of an empire as well as the retention of Alsace and Lorraine. In 1878, two attempts upon the life of the Emperor made by men who were socialists, although the acts were disavowed by the party, provided the government with an excellent excuse to resort to repression. By an act of 1878, all socialist societies were ordered to be disbanded; labour organisations were placed under rigid police control; socialist meetings were prohibited; socialist newspapers were suppressed. The propagation of socialist doctrines was penalised, and provision was made for proclamation of martial law when necessary. The law was severely enforced. From 1878 to 1890, 1400 publications were suppressed, 900 socialists exiled and 1500 imprisoned. Thus the organisation of the socialists was no doubt destroyed, but repression served to drive the movement underground. Secret societies sprang up. Coffee houses and smokers' circles were the usual venues of the socialists. In 1881, the socialist deputation in the Reichstag sank to three. In 1884, however, 24 seats were captured by the socialists;

in 1890, 35 seats were won. Evidently repression was a failure. From their privileged places in the Reichstag where not even Bismarck could silence them, the great socialist leaders, Liebknecht and Babel made continuous appeal to the nation in behalf of their persecuted compatriots. In 1890, the Reichstag with the sanction of the new Emperor William II wisely declined to renew the reactionary statute of 1878.

But repression was not the sole weapon in the armoury of Bismarck. He was determined to forestal the socialists, and he initiated a programme of reforms of a strongly socialistic character. It was an attempt "to cure the empire of socialism by inoculation." The result was the famous State-Insurance Laws: insurance against illness (1883), insurance against accident (1884), insurance against old age and invalidity (1889). The laws mitigated the keenness of the social discontent. It is interesting to quote some of the statements which Bismarck made on these occasions. "Give the workingmen the right to work as long as he is healthy, assure him care when he is sick, and maintenance when he is old. Do not fear the sacrifice involved, or cry out at state-socialism, as soon as the words 'provison for old age' are uttered. If the state will show a little more Christian solicitude for workingmen, then the socialists will sing their siren song in vain, and the working men will cease to throng to their banner

as soon as they see that the government and the legislative bodies are earnestly concerned for their welfare." "The whole matter centres in the question, "Is it the duty of the state or is it not, to provide for its helpless citizens?" I maintain that it is its duty, that it is the duty not only of the 'Christian State' as I ventured once to call it when speaking of practical Christianity, but of every state. It would be foolish for a corporation to undertake matters which the individual can attend to alone; and similarly the purposes which the parish can fulfil with justice and with advantage are left to the parish. But there are purposes which only the state as a whole can fulfil.....To these...belong the help of the necessitous and the removal of those just complaints which provide Social Democracy with really effective material for agitation. This is the duty of the state, a duty which the state can not permanently disregard." The Bismarckian State-Socialism ultimately became the model for liberal England in the first decade of the twentieth century.

Bismarck and Protection :

Throughout his life, Bismarck regarded himself to be the champion of the agricultural interests of Germany. It was mainly to protect and encourage German agriculture that in 1879, he enacted a tariff law which included 42 groups of commodities, agricultural as well as industrial. Protection of the

native industries apart, the policy was intended to secure an increase of the imperial revenues. This was not a departure. Protection was the German tradition and Bismarck in 1879 was merely following the tradition. As one who disliked direct taxation, the policy was more or less indispensable for him.

“Dropping the Pilot”:

The old King William I passed away on March 9, 1888. He was succeeded by his son Frederick III, the son-in-law of Queen Victoria of Britain. Frederick was liberal in his outlook and every one apprehended collision between the new King and the old Chancellor. But the King was smitten with an incurable malady, a cancer in his throat. He reigned for only 99 days and passed away on June 15, 1888. He was succeeded by his son William II. William was a very accomplished and energetic prince. Though not a liberal like his father, his outlook was to a great extent modern. The youthful king was the true representative of Young Germany,—Germany aspiring for colonial possessions and commercial supremacy throughout the world. Bismarck, on the other hand, was a man of the old world, a man who had serious misgivings regarding colonial enterprise and whose sole concern was to create differences among the enemies of Germany. Hence differences between the old Chancellor and

the new Kaiser were inevitable. The final breach was due to the Kaiser's theory of kingship. Like George III of England he was bent upon removing the influence of the Chancellor who stood between the King and the Ministers. Bismarck very soon understood the motives of the Kaiser and asked his permission to resign. The permission was given most warmly (March 1890). Bismarck behaved somewhat unsportsmanlike by resorting to continuous attacks on the government policy through the press. He died on July 30, 1898.

[Bismarck's foreign policy after 1870 will be described in connection with the diplomacy preceding the world war.]

Estimate of Bismarck:

Though "blood and iron" was the catchword of Bismarckian state-craft, he was never a believer in catchwords. He was a man of action and unlike Metternich and Palmerston, he hated the use of rhetoric. Within ten years of his coming to power, he succeeded in knitting together the fragments of German peoples into a strong self-conscious national state. When he sank into the background (1890), he could boast of having bequeathed to posterity a well consolidated state, on its way to industrial supremacy. In more sense than one, this patriotic Junker may be called the founder of the greatness of the German nation.

Bismarck was indeed a man of *ancien regime* but he was not a die-hard. He was no doctrinaire and he condemned radicalism as well as legitimism. He was a believer in expediency. He maintained that in the tactics of statesmanship, interests were more important than principles.

He had no love for democracy, specially as one who had witnessed the great debacle of 1848. He was no parliamentarian, but he was wise not to wound the susceptibilities of the parliament. Like the Tudor ministers of 16th century England, he knew how to exact the approval of the parliament for his measures. We can mention in this connection the Bill of Indemnity which he brought forward after the great victory of Koniggratz and by which he sought to legalise his actions upto that time.

Bismarck's diplomacy was not merely "blood and iron." His diplomacy may be truly expressed as a policy of "divide and rule." He was always careful to see that enemies might not combine against his government. In 1864, 1866, 1870, the three momentous years for Germany, before taking the risk of a war he always took care to isolate the enemy and render it helpless. His foreign policy after 1870 was also directed with a view to creating differences between France, Britain and Russia, the potential enemies of Germany.

His management of home affairs was also characterised by the principle of "divide and rule". With the help of the Liberals he fought the Catholics, with

the help of the Catholics (Centre party) he fought the Socialists.

His state-socialism was the sincere attempt of a man of *ancien regime* to lend a helping hand to the poor and the helpless. Long after he passed away the great Liberal minister of Britain, David Lloyd George, found it worth while to copy the Junker of Brandenburg.

His greatest achievement will for all time be the unification of Germany. The German state built up by Bismarck is something like a Cyclopean wall which can stand a hundred blows directed against it. Unified Germany stood the test of the storm and the stress (1914-1919). Poincare's strategy to drive a wedge between the Protestant North and the Catholic South failed to strike a responsive chord in the Catholic hearts.

[Bismarck's antipathy to colonial adventures as well as his attitude towards the army will be discussed in connection with the diplomacy preceding the world war.]

Kaiser Willam II (1888-1919):

The new ruler, a young man of twenty-nine years of age, was not a mediocre born in the purple. A man of unusual vigour and extraordinary intellect, he had passed through a severe military training and at the same time had early acquired a taste for literature and archaeology. He took pride in the name

of the German and nursed the idea that Germany was destined to lead the world in many spheres of activity. He was unfortunately also a victim to the idea that Germany badly needed his sole leadership. "There is only one master in this country, and I am he," he said, "I shall suffer no other beside me." He was also a believer in divine right. "I see in the people and the land which have descended to me a talent entrusted to me by God, which it is my duty to increase." His ideals of divine right and personal government were out of date. But in face of the conflicting reports it is really very difficult to say to what extent he influenced the administration of the country. Historians of the powers which were arrayed against Germany in the last War are more or less unanimous in saying that the chancellors of William II were in fact as well as in theory his servants, carrying out their master's wish. Four chancellors served him after Bismarck: Count Caprivi (1890-94), Prince Hohenlohe (1894-1900), Prince Bulow (1900-1909) and Bethmann Hollweg (1909-1917). During the fateful years of 1917-18 three chancellors served in succession.

Growth of German Industry:

The reign of William II will for ever remain famous for the remarkable economic development of Germany. Protectionism and state subsidies, combined with rapid progress in applied sciences, produced

amazing results. Iron, coal and other natural resources were fully utilised. Chemists and engineers, enjoying state patronage, helped Germany to rival and even surpass the old industrial countries like Britain and U. S. A. Foreign markets were easily captured, as "Made in Germany" always stood for quality and low price. The result was a growing desire for colonial expansion. On the other hand industrial growth added to the social troubles which Bismarck had sought to check. William II, who had none of the pro-Junker prejudices of Bismarck, was somewhat sympathetic to the industrial workers. It was on his initiative that the repressive laws of 1878 were abandoned. In 1911 a comprehensive piece of legislation was passed with a view to fight sickness, accident and invalidity. An elaborate organisation was established for operating this code. Various minor socialistic laws were also passed. In spite of all this socialism as an anti-government force gradually grew in strength.

Growth of German Navy :

For the protection of German overseas trade the necessity of a strong navy was naturally felt. The desire for colonial adventures and the establishment of a colonial empire could not be realised without a strong navy. Hence William II was determined to make Germany a great naval power: "Our future lies on the sea, I will never rest until I have raised

my Navy to a position similar to that occupied by my Army. German colonial ends can be gained only when Germany has become master on the ocean." In 1890 Germany abandoned all claims to Uganda and recognised a British protectorate over Zanzibar; Britain ceded Heligoland to Germany. Heligoland provided a convenient naval base at the mouth of the Elbe and the Kiel canal was completed in 1895. Admiral Tirpitz who was the Secretary of the Navy from 1897, was also a champion of the navy cause. In 1900 he induced the Reichstag to pass a Navy Act which would double the navy by 1920. In 1906, the Kiel canal was ordered to be made large enough for the passage of Dreadnoughts. Britain was alarmed and she asked for the reduction of navy scheme. The pour-parlers, in which the British statesman Viscount Maldane took a conspicuous part, failed. Tirpitz continued to carry into effect his ambitious naval policy. This strained AngloGerman relations.

The Kaiser and Welt Politik:

In August 1911, at Hamburg, Emperor William II bluntly advocated the need for strengthening the German navy so that "no one can dispute with us the place in the sun that is our due." He was the true representative of the generation which attained manhood long after the unification was achieved—the generation which hankered after colonial possessions as an outlet for the surplus population of

Germany and as markets for German products. Thus interference in world politics was a logical outcome of the industrial development of nineteenth century Germany. The Kaiser did not hesitate to interfere in the affairs of the East, both Far and Near. In 1895, he joined France and Russia in ordering Japan to relinquish Liaotung. In 1897, he compelled China to lease Kiaochow; in 1899 a new foothold in the Pacific was secured by the purchase of the Caroline Islands from Spain. In 1900, a German general led the joint international force which marched against Peking to secure the redress of certain wrongs done to some Europeans in China. In the Near East also he evinced a similar interest. With the withdrawal of Britain from Turkey Germany slipped into the position of Turkey's patron. In 1898, he declared at Damascus, "The three hundred million Muhammadans who, dwelling dispersed throughout the East, reverence in his majesty the Sultan Abdul Hamid, their Khalif, may rest assured that at all times the German Emperor will be their friend." Such a pronouncement was particularly galling to Britain whose Empire counted a large number of Muhammadan subjects. A few years after, he secured from the Sultan the consent for the construction of a railway from Constantinople to Baghdad. Though a commercial project the scheme because of its strategic importance naturally aroused the hostility of Britain.

[The details of the foreign policy of Kaiser William II will be discussed in connection with the diplomacy preceding the last War. The sections on the Eastern Question as well as the Far East may also be referred to in this connection.]

References :

Robertson: Bismarck.

Dawson: The German Empire, 1867-1919.

Ward: Germany.

RUSSIA 1850-1914

Czar Nicholas I (1825-55):

Nicholas from his early youth was a hater of democracy. He had watched with glee how his eldest brother Alexander I had been transformed from a liberal ruler into an autocrat. Due to its violent opposition against his accession, Nicholas had become a staunch enemy of liberalism. His thirty years' reign was devoted to the defence of autocracy at home and abroad. Through the agencies of a brutal police and an elaborate censorship he successfully carried into effect a system of undeviating repression. The usual form of punishment was the exile to Siberia. Religious persecution was added to political. At the same time he launched a policy of Russification. Poland was his special target for this Kultur movement. Nicholas was a true lover of Russian culture and institutions. He systematically favoured literature and his reign was the Augustan age of Russia. Pushkin, Dostoïffesky, Turgenev and Tolstovsky, the author of the Russian national anthem, "God protect the Czar," flourished during his reign and enjoyed his patronage. He fully realised that nationalism, if carefully nursed, would be the antidote of international liberalism and would provide a spiritual support for Russian imperialism. "He encouraged Slavophilism in so far as it abetted his dream of

unification, but rebuked its appeals to revolutionary passion.” (Skryne) He could not tolerate revolution abroad. In 1849 he signalled his hatred of democracy by sending two hundred thousand Russian troops to Hungary to put down the insurrection there. But the acid test of the efficiency of his administration was provided by the Crimean War.

Causes of the Crimean War:

Nicholas was firmly convinced that the dissolution of the Turkish Empire was imminent and he was always planning as to the partition of the legacy of “the sick man.” He frankly proposed to British ambassadors that Britain should secure Egypt and the neighbouring regions while the Balkan states should come under the protection of Russia. Britain however rejected this proposal. Nicholas had another firm conviction. He believed that an alliance between Britain and France was impossible. Labouring under these impressions he opposed the claims of the French government upon the Holy Places in Palestine. He took his stand under the treaty of Kuchuk Kainarji (1774) by which Russia had been given the protectorate over the Greek Church, and championed the rights of Greek pilgrims. The Sultan of Turkey was assailed on both sides. The Sultan however realised that this was the opportune time for extricating the Ottoman Empire from the talons of Russia. When the Czar’s ambassador Menshikoff

showed an uncompromising attitude, the Sultan under the advice of the clever British diplomat Lord Stratford de Redcliff refused to comply to the Russian point of view. The result was a Russo-Turkish war (June 1853). Russia very soon found to her dismay that Britain, allied with France, backed Turkey.

Crimean War:

The war started on June 22, 1853 when Russia invaded Moldavia and Wallachia. The Czar declared that he was occupying these principalities in order to secure recognition for the rights of Russia. After the failure of further negotiations Turkey declared war against Russia (October 5, 1853). Russia accepted the challenge confidently expecting that the war would be limited to them. But within a fortnight the French and the British fleets passed the Dardanelles. On November 30, a Turkish squadron anchoring at Sinope, on the northern coast of Asia Minor, was suddenly assailed and destroyed, one vessel alone escaping. It recalled the incident of Navarino (1827) but was certainly an act of war on the part of Russia and not an "untoward incident," as the Navarino episode was claimed to be. A wave of indignation however ran through Britain and France, and the allied fleet entered the Black Sea (January, 1854). A note which was in the nature of an ultimatum presented by the

Allies to Nicholas I, was now rejected, by the Czar. Britain and France then entered into a treaty of alliance with Turkey. Thus for the first time since the days of Cromwell, Britain and France were united against a common enemy; two Christian powers were determined to humiliate another Christian power to uphold the prestige of an Asiatic power. It was a modern war in this sense of the term that sentiments of religion did not dictate the alignment of belligerents. Nicholas I was stunned but he accepted the challenge. Piedmont also joined the side of Turkey merely to win the interests of Britain and France for Cavour's plans for the making of Italy. The Western Powers had expected great things of their fleets but their hopes were doomed to disappointment. Russia is essentially a terrestrial power; and her ports are well-protected by nature and artificial obstacles. French sea-power had not recovered from the ruin inflicted by Britain during the Napoleonic wars, while the British navy had deteriorated during the forty years of comparative inaction. British ships were ill-equipped and worse manned; their commanders were no longer men of the stamp formed by Nelson's spirit and example. (Skrine) The squadrons which entered the Black Sea performed the futile bombardment of Odessa (April 21, 1854). The Allied Baltic fleet's achievements were hardly more brilliant. The British cruisers

contented themselves with harrying the settlements of peaceable Finnish traders and destroying a fortified monastery on the White Sea, In the Far East an Anglo-French squadron was beaten off the shores of Kamchatka. In the meantime the principalities were evacuated and peace might have been restored but the opportunity of giving a crushing blow to Russia was too good to be lost, though Russia was willing to come to terms. The allied generals searched for a weak spot in Russia's armour and ultimately adopted the design of making Sebastopol, the capital of the Crimean peninsula, the objective. The idea had first occurred in the brains of some Austrian master of strategy in 1819. It was an excellent idea. An expedition into the heart of Russia was Napoleon's undoing in 1812. The Little Napoleon avoided repeating the mistake of his great uncle. The Allies fastened like a vampire upon the big toe of Russia. This phase of the war was so important in deciding the fate of Russia and of the Allies that the war was afterwards christened as the Crimean war.

During the first two weeks of September 1854 a fleet of five hundred vessels of war and transport crossed the Black Sea without molestation and landed 21000 English, 29000 French and 6000 Turkish troops on the western coast of Crimea. The move fell as a thunderbolt on Russia. Russian war-office had concentrated on guarding the harbours and had never

expected such a move. The war-ships which might have wrought havoc were sunk to obstruct the entrance of harbour to Sebastopol. But Russia had a large army and Menshikoff was ordered to resist the allied army in their march towards Sebastopol. At Alma allied troops defeated and routed the Russians (September 20). Sebastopol lay at the victors' mercy, but the Allies made a great mistake in delaying the siege of their objective. In the meantime Colonel Todleben, the greatest military engineer of the century, quickly got up defensive works around Sebastopol and trenches were constructed. So when the allied troops reached Sebastopol they found that the siege would be a protracted and difficult one. The differences between the French and English generals also contributed much to the delay in starting operations. The siege lasted eleven months. Sebastopol was defended in a masterly fashion by Todleben and the first allied bombardment was futile. On October 25, Menshikoff attacked the Allies from the east. A battle took place at Balaclava. Due to some mistake on the part of some British general the body of light cavalry in a moment of heroic folly delivered a frontal attack. The splendid charge has been rendered immortal by Tennyson in his "The charge of the Light Brigade". Another heroic incident was the battle of Inkermann (November 5). Menshikoff, reinforced by a vast number of troops from the Danube, took the British army unawares. The British

fought gallantly, and ultimately the Russians had to retreat with heavy loss. But the casualties on the side of the Allies were also so heavy that Sebastopol could not be taken by assault. The siege was thus converted into a winter campaign. Due to mismanagement on the part of British War Office, British troops suffered much owing to lack of stores. The Russian winter told heavily upon the ill-fed and ill-clad foreigners. Nine thousand British troops died in hospital before the end of February 1855. The organising capacity and the affectionate treatment of Florence Nightingale relieved to a great extent the sufferings of the soldiers. On February 17, 1855 the Turks defeated the Russians at Eupatoria. Czar Nicholas I could not stand the series of Russian defeats. He passed away on March 2, 1855. He faced death calmly and he is said to have enjoined his successor to undertake the liberation of the serfs and the conclusion of peace. Sebastopol surrendered on September 8, 1855. The new Czar, Alexander II, agreed to conclude peace.

The Peace of Paris:

The terms of peace were settled at a congress at Paris and the treaty was signed on March 30, 1856. The treaty provided that the Black Sea should henceforth be neutralised and that warships should not be given access to the Black Sea. The navigation of the Danube was declared free. The Russian

protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia was abolished and they were declared independent under the suzerainty of the Porte. Turkey was admitted into the European family of states. (For details as also for criticism of the Treaty of Paris see the section on the Eastern Question).

Results of the Crimean War :

Absolutism thrives on the achievement of glory abroad. Thus the fate of autocracy depends on the course of foreign affairs. George III failed in his effort to be a king in name as well as in fact, not because of the opposition at home but because of his failure to crush the American Rebellion. The Second French Empire collapsed not before the radical propaganda of the students' quarter and the law courts, but before the Prussian guns. The last War (1914) was also responsible for causing the fall of many autocracies this way. Hence it is but natural that the debacle of Crimea would serve as a rude shock to the Czarist autocracy. The war exposed the lack of efficiency and integrity of the government which had so long cowed the teeming millions of Russia. People lost faith in the divine patriarchal system and one revolutionary writer challenged the dying Czar Nicholas with the following words :

“Awake, oh Russia, from the sleep of ignorance and apathy! Too long have we been kept in serfage by a succession of Tatar Khans. Demand of the

despot a reckoning for the national misfortunes. Blinded by passion, thou, Oh Czar, hast sought no aim but personal power. Thy life has gone in reviewing troops and signing the legislative projects of charlatans. By thy pride and obstinacy thou hast exhausted Russia and aroused the world against Russia. Bow thy haughty forehead in the dust; throw thyself into thy peoples' arms, there is no other way of salvation."

Such invectives eluded the censor and though unprinted circulated widely. People were eager for reforms.

The government rather the new government, was also not slow to take lessons from this misfortune. "Nations like individuals find a sure counsellor in misfortune. The day dawned for Prussia on the morrow of Jena (1806); the foundations of Italian unity were laid in the agony of defeat at Novara... France emerged from the purifying flames of Sedan with chastened pride and a resolve to become worthy of her high destinies.....Russia suffered but a transient pang of wounded pride and in less than half a century she obliterated every humiliating condition imposed on her at Paris. The moral effect of her discomfiture remained and it was wholly beneficial. It demonstrated not only the inherent weakness of ultra-conservative ideals, but the necessity under which Russia lay of advancing to the level attained by western Europe". (Skrine) It is to the new Czar

Alexander's eternal credit that he strove to understand this necessity and acted accordingly. He had confidence in his subjects and launched the country on a path of social and economic reform.

The Reforms of Alexander:

The reforms of Alexander were mainly of three classes: economic, administrative and judicial. The economic reforms were by far the most radical and gained for him a niche in the history of civilisation. These affected the institutions of serfdom, and land-tenure. About nine-tenths of the arable land of Russia were either crown dominions, appanages or hereditary possessions of the nobility. The land was therefore generally held in large estates. It was owned by a small minority; it was filled by the millions of serfs. This cruel system was strongly entrenched in tradition and in the predilections and interests of the nobles; once wealth indeed was reckoned not in the acres of land but on the number of 'souls' that one possessed. The system none the less offended the most enlightened moral sense of the age. It had even been attacked on purely economic grounds. From the era of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars the institution was subjected to an increasing amount of criticism. In 1819 Czar Alexander I liberated the serfs of the Baltic provinces, which unfortunately rendered them landless freemen. Now Czar Alexander II was determined

to solve the problem without causing any harm to either party. He recognised fully that a mere grant of personal freedom would be insufficient. "Liberation without land," he rightly said, "has always ended in an increase of the proprietors' arbitrary power." Landless freemen constitute a danger to the safety of a state. Therefore both on ethical as well as political grounds the unfortunate experiment of 1819 was to be avoided. A thorough enquiry into the problem was made by means of provincial committees and a central commission (1857-60). In the meantime the serfs on the crownlands and the appanages were liberated and invested with full ownership of their lands. In March 1861, the Edict of Emancipation was issued. It abolished serfdom throughout the Empire. It did not merely declare the serfs freemen; but it undertook also to solve the far more difficult problem of the ownership of the soil. The nobles were not compensated but they were confirmed in the ownership of their lands. The lands were divided into two parts. The landlords were to keep one; the other was to go to the peasants either individually or collectively as members of the village community or 'mir' to which they belonged. The peasants were to pay the landlord for the lands thus assigned; but as the emancipated had not the resources to purchase lands, the state advanced money. These loans were recoverable with the Imperial taxes in instalments. This solution of a highly complex

problem was satisfactory to both sides. "History can show no parallel to the abolition of serfdom in Russia." (Skrine) In France this was achieved through a violent revolution. Prussian peasants were freed in 1809, but they were left in their lords' tutelage. Napoleon's emancipation of the serfs in Poland created a rural proletariat. Negro emancipation carried out by Britain in 1833 did little justice to the slave-owners. Emancipation of Negro slaves in the United States of America was secured on the point of the sword. Yet this great reform of Alexander proved to be an unmixed blessing to the ignorant and suspicious peasants. They believed that the land belonged to them, and thus would ill appreciate the method of compensating the nobles. The peasants who through centuries of bondage had lost power of initiative were at first misfits in the regime of free competition. They found livelihood harder than before. The communal system of land-management bred class-war. A shrewd statesman, Count Shuvaloff, remarked rightly, "The last word of reform will be spoken when the liberation of the Russian people reaches the individual. Encourage individual property and you will stifle communism; strengthen the family and you will start the nation on the path of progress." Spread of anarchical principles of government made a large number of converts among the emancipated peasants.

The Crimean war had exposed the inefficiency of

the administration, and the new Czar introduced radical changes to overhaul the century-old machinery of government. The censorship of the press was relaxed and its unsparing criticism proved a more effectual check on official vagaries than Nicholas' punishments. Universities were thrown open to all in order to train the best talents in the country. The secret police lost the pre-eminence which it enjoyed during the reign of Nicholas I. Central control over the provinces and districts was relaxed. According to a decree of 1864, each district and each province was to have a 'Zemstvo' or assembly composed of big landholders and traders as well as peasants; and each Zemstvo was to exercise legislative and executive authority over local affairs. The army and the fleet whose heroism was so unavailing in the Crimean War did not escape the general ardour for reform. Military schools were re-organised on western models. Unfortunately the cadets of these schools, freed from the iron discipline of Nicholas I, began to dabble in politics. During the reign of Nicholas I, justice had been dispensed by state-officials arbitrarily and secretly. In 1862 Alexander II decreed the separation of the judiciary from the executive. A regular hierarchy of courts on western model was instituted, jury trial was introduced for criminal cases and court proceedings were made public.

Response to these reforms was however dis-

appointing. People clamoured for further reforms. The concessions of Alexander II merely served to encourage the discontented elements to harrangue and defy the government.

The Polish Insurrection (1863):

After the failure of their attempt to achieve independence in 1831, the Poles had remained quiet. The reforms of Alexander however aroused hopes of better conditions. The spirit of nationalism revived, greatly encouraged by the success of the Italian nationalists. When Alexander told them emphatically that they must abandon all thoughts of independence, the Poles became desperate and engineered a revolt. The insurrection broke out in 1863. The Poles expected foreign intervention from the precedent of Italy. England expressed only lip-sympathy. Napoleon III's remonstrance in favour of the Poles met with rebuff at the hands of Alexander. Supported by Prussia, Russia treated any intervention as impertinence and proceeded to wreck her vengeance on the Poles. The insurrection was ruthlessly crushed. As the Polish nobles were the leaders of this insurrection a policy of divide and rule in favour of the peasants was introduced. The process of Russification started by Nicholas I was continued with ever-increasing vigour. Russian was made the official language. Use of Polish was forbidden in the

churches and schools of Lithuania. To destroy the influences of Catholicism, Greek missions worked in Lithuania and made a large number of converts.

Nihilism :

At about the same time an agitation, which was revolutionary in every sense of the term, started. The anarchical doctrines of Nihilism first took shape in the reign of Alexander II. The movement was thus named by Turgenev in his *Fathers and Sons* (1862). Nihilism stood for the negation and destruction of existing institutions, social, economic or political. The anarchists were in favour of starting with a *tabula rasa*. Like most ideas current in Russia, Nihilism also came to her from the west. It germinated in the brains of the French philosophers of the 18th century and passing through Germany it found a congenial soil in the universities of Russia. The impulsive Slav nature, prone to yearnings for the good of mankind, chafed under domestic tyranny, and vague speculations became in time a positive creed. "The fundamental principle of Nihilism," says Stepniak, "was absolute individualism. It was the negation in the name of individual liberty of all the obligations imposed upon the individual by society, by family life and by religion." The justification of their advocacy of destruction of the existing order was provided by Bakunin, who said

that this was necessary "in order that all these millions of poor human beings who were cheated, enslaved, overworked and exploited.....may henceforth and for ever breathe in absolute freedom." Shortly socialism was grafted upon this anarchy of Bakunin. This was the second phase of the movement. It had been an abstract philosophy: it became a party programme. Emerging from the realm of speculation it entered that of practical politics. A campaign of propaganda was launched. The universities and the schools were the first converts. The Nihilist missionaries then started work among the masses. "Go among the People" became the catchword of the students throughout Russia. Though such a highly intellectual movement could not be much successful with the masses they were convinced somewhat vaguely about the wrongs of the existing order.

Thus a policy of reaction was forced upon the Czar. The tightening of the press censorship was followed by re-invigoration of the secret police. The zemstvos were forbidden to express political opinions. Political offenders were tried arbitrarily and sent to Siberia. Between 1863 and 1874 nearly 150 thousand persons were deported to Siberia. The government repression was met by terrorism. The shibboleth of "Go among the People" gave place to the cry of "Let us act." Murder of government officials, spies and even of the Czar himself was planned. The Prefect

of St. Petersburg, the Rector of Kiev University and Prince Kropotkin, the governor of Kharkov, were among the first victims. The government was driven to increased repression. But it was greeted with increasing terrorism. Many futile attempts were made on the life of the Czar. General Melikoff, an efficient officer with liberal views, was placed in charge of the government. Melikoff was in favour of a policy of conciliation. Hundreds of prisoners were released and in many cases the death sentence was commuted. He ultimately persuaded the Czar to grant a liberal constitution. He held that the battle against anarchy could be won only by enlisting the good will of the people and investing them with the sense of responsibility. After much hesitation the Czar agreed. On March 13, 1881 he ordered the publication of Melikoff's scheme, but on that same afternoon assassin's bombs found their mark. With the murder of the Czar-liberator, the policy of conciliation was discredited.

The Foreign Policy of Alexander II:

After the disaster of the Crimean war Alexander wisely refrained from taking any part in the affairs of Europe and began to carry on an aggressive policy in the East. Turkestan was conquered in 1865. The Khan of Khiya was reduced to a vassal (1873) and Khokand was also conquered. By two expeditions, eastern and western Caucasus was annexed. In

1870, taking advantage of the pre-occupation of the Western Powers with the Franco-German War, he denounced the treaty of Paris as regards the neutralisation of the Black Sea. Britain which was in constant dread of the expansion of Russia made a futile protest and ultimately at a conference the European Powers abrogated this provision of the treaty of Paris. In 1872 an agreement was made with Britain regarding their respective spheres of influence in Afghanistan, but the fears of British statesmen were not allayed. From 1875 Alexander was again tempted to interfere in European politics. In that year an insurrection took place in the Turkish province of Herzegovina due to the exactions of tax-farmers. Next year the Bulgarians rose in revolt. The Turkish government crushed the insurrection by a policy of ruthless brutality. The Bulgarian atrocities thrilled all Europe with horror. Gladstone prescribed the policy of expelling the Turks 'bag and baggage' from the territories they had profaned. Montenegro and Serbia in sympathy with the Bulgarians declared war against Turkey. The Serbians however fared badly. Russia as a champion of the Slav nations would not stand the destruction of Serbia. Alexander II declared war on April 24, 1877. The chief feature of the campaign was the famous siege of Plevna. After a gallant defence Plevna fell to Todleben in December 1877. Within a few months Turkey made peace with Russia. By the treaty of

San Stephano, Turkey was divested of all its territories where the Christians predominated, but Britain under conservative ministry interfered. Disraeli, the British premier, could not tolerate the destruction of the Turkish bulwark between Russia and the British Empire in the East. At a conference called at Berlin the affairs were considered afresh. The terms of the Berlin Treaty prevented Russia from reaping this new harvest. (For details of the Berlin Treaty, see the section on the Near Eastern Question). Thus English diplomacy nullified the ambitious scheme of Russia in the Balkans. Henceforth Russia was compelled to expand eastwards. Russian movements in Afghanistan had already aroused suspicion in the mind of the then Viceroy of India, Lord Lytton. The result was the Second Anglo-Afghan War (1878-79). At the time of Alexander's assassination Afghanistan was under British influence. (In 1907 Czar Nicholas II recognised Afghanistan as a state within British sphere of influence. This finally allayed the fears of Anglo-Indian statesmen.)

The Reactionary Policy of Alexander III (1881-1894) and Nicholas II (1894-1917):

Infuriated by his father's sad end Alexander naturally adopted a course of repression. Melikoff was displaced by reactionary conservative ministers. The press was thoroughly gagged. Scholars were watched and if found dangerous were hounded

out to Siberia. The reforms of Alexander II were partly withdrawn and the secret police was re-invigorated. The policy of Russification was continued with enviable ardour. As a corollary to this policy an anti-Semite programme was launched. The Jews were always hated in Russia for their clannishness and notions of racial superiority. Recently they had swelled the ranks of revolutionaries. Backed by popular anti-Semite feelings Alexander III instituted a series of repressive measures against them. They were deprived of their political and economic rights; even decent civic existence was made impossible for them. They were subjected to organised popular attacks called Pogroms. The great Jewish emigration to the United States began from this time. Alexander's son and successor Nicholas II continued the traditions of his father. Censorship reached its climax during his reign. Books like Green's History of England and Bryce's American Commonwealth were under the ban. In one sphere however Russia made some progress. For centuries Russia had been an agricultural country and one of the poorest, her immense resources being undeveloped. The system of protection adopted by Alexander II and augmented by Alexander III gave a great fillip to the development of industries. Foreign capital was encouraged and land-banks were instituted. Railway lines were constructed; the most famous of these,

the Trans-Siberian line, was opened in 1902. Industrialisation however created, as in all countries, an urban proletariat with its concomitant problems. Revolutionary propaganda found congenial soil in this class, but Nicholas II was adamant and returned a deaf ear to all demands for the liberty of the press and representative government. In 1905 the disaster of the Russo-Japanese war discredited the government.

The Russo-Japanese War:

Headed off from the Balkans and Afghanistan, Russia naturally hankered for an outlet in the Far East. She was badly in need of a sea-board on 'warm waters.' She had no doubt the longest sea-board in the north, but the Arctic coast (being frozen for a large part of the year) was useless for naval purposes. Her aspirations in the Black Sea met with a rebuff at the hands of Britain. Hence she was forced to advance towards the Pacific. But Japan was also at this time aiming at pre-eminence in the Pacific. China was at that time the most impotent of the great nations of the world. Thus Russia and Japan both tried to expand at the expense of China. In 1894 Japan defeated China and proceeded to annex Liaotung and Formosa. Russia however intervened and supported by France and Germany forced Japan to relinquish Liaotung. In 1898, Russia secured from China the strategic point

of Port Arthur in Liaotung, on a lease for twenty-five years. Japan grew indignant. When in 1902 the construction of the Trans-Siberian railway was completed, Russian encroachment in Manchuria reached its climax. Thousands of Russian troops were garrisoned in Manchuria and a strong fleet was stationed at Port Arthur. Assured of English neutrality, Japan risked a war. Near Mukden the Japanese inflicted crushing defeats upon the Russians. This was followed by the terrific bombardment of Port Arthur. The climax was reached when on May 27, 1905, Admiral Togo annihilated the Russian fleet in the Straits of Tsushima. By the treaty of Portsmouth Russia recognised Japan's sphere of influence in Korea, transferred to Japan the lease of Port Arthur and ceded the southern half of Saghalin. (For details and criticism see the relevant section on the Far East.)

Russia since the war with Japan:

Like the Crimean war the Russo-Japanese war helped the inauguration of liberal reforms in Russia. The government was discredited and assassinations again started. The reactionary minister Plehve was killed in July 1904. A few days after the surrender of Port Arthur workmen in large numbers tried to approach the Czar for the redress of grievances (January 22, 1905). They were however greeted with bullets. The result was a fearful massacre.

This led to the outbreak of risings throughout the country. In October 1905, the Czar issued a ukase establishing a State Duma which was to be elected on a wide franchise and without whose approval no law was to come in force. The Czar however very soon established a Council of the Empire, a sort of upper chamber. The elections to the Duma held in 1906 resulted in a large majority for the constitutional democrats. Very soon wrangling between the Duma and the ministry started. The Czar had to dissolve the Duma. The Second Duma was also not satisfactory to the government. The Czar was ultimately forced to withdraw the reforms and resort to unconstitutional measures. The reaction was triumphant. The Russian autocracy learned no lesson from the great defeat of 1904 and permitted no honest criticism of itself. Corruption and inefficiency reigned supreme. Court-life became scandalous. During the War (1914) a mysterious figure, Rasputin, exercised an amazing and sinister influence on the Court. The disasters of the War put an end to the Russian autocracy.

(During the nineties of the nineteenth century Russia entered into an alliance with France. In 1907 Russia, France and Britain entered into a Triple Entente. For details see the section on Diplomacy: 1870-1914)

Reference:

Skrine: Expansion of Russia.

THE EASTERN QUESTION

The Problem :

The primary and most essential factor in the problem was the presence embedded in the living flesh of Europe of an alien substance, the Turks. Thus the Eastern Question involves the study of the story of the Ottoman Turks in Europe, the story of the Ottoman conquests, the organisation of the Ottoman Empire and the relations between the conquerors and the conquered. The rise of various Balkan races along with fall of the Ottomans formed the crux of the problem. But very soon many of the great powers of Europe came to be vitally interested in the affairs of the Balkan Peninsula. This complicated the issues of the affairs of the Near East, and a comprehensive nomenclature was resorted to. "That sifting intrac-table and interwoven tangle of conflicting interests, rival peoples and antagonistic faiths, that is veiled under the easy name of this Eastern Question" (John Morley). We propose to deal with this "tangle of conflicting interests, rival peoples and antagonistic faiths" in this section.

The Advent of the Turks :

The Ottoman Turks, a fierce and warlike Asiatic people, began to invade south-eastern Europe in the 14th century and within a hundred and fifty years, the whole of the Balkan Peninsula passed into their

hands. Constantinople fell in 1453. The advent of the Turks constitutes a land mark in the history of Europe. "When the Turks threw themselves across the ancient paths in the 15th Century A. D. a great necessity arose in Christendom for searching out new lines of approach to India. From that quest the history of modern commerce begins" (W. W. Hunter). This not only led to the discovery of newer routes to the known lands, it quite accidentally led to the discovery of a new world in the west. The nations which took leading parts in these adventures were not the Venetian or the Florentine merchants of the old, but the Spaniards, the Portuguese, the Dutch and the English who had little idea as to what lay in future. The Ottoman conquest was also responsible for bringing about a renaissance in Europe. During the middle ages Greek learning, due to the fearless freedom of thought which pervaded the Greek literature, came to be deliberately neglected. In Constantinople however, there was a pretty large number of scholars who handed down from generation to generation the lore of Ancient Greece. From the time of the advent of the Ottoman Turks these Greek scholars apprehending rough treatment from the new-comers began to migrate to Italy and Central Europe. The unlocking of this old literature created a revolution in the outlook of the peoples in Italy and Germany. A spirit of criticism generated a quest for the unknown and Europe began to pass

through a period of renaissance. The most immediate effect was the Protestant movement. There is much significance in the following remark of Lord Acton: Modern History begins under the stress of Ottoman conquest.

Progress of the Turks up to 1683:

From the fourteenth century onwards the advance of the Ottomans had been pretty uniformly successful. In Asia, they were the masters of Asia Minor, Armenia, Syria, Caucasia, the Euphrates valley and the shores of the Red Sea. In Africa they conquered Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis and Algeria. In Europe, they were the masters of the northern shores of the Black Sea, and the entire Balkan peninsula. The Black Sea became a Turkish lake. With their hold on the Aegean Archipelago and the islands of Cyprus, Crete, and the Rhodes, they made themselves the masters of the Eastern Mediterranean also. The Habsburg Empire was forced to pay a tribute and it seemed as if all Europe would very soon be absorbed within the Ottoman Empire. But their progress received a sudden check in 1683. In that year the Turks had besieged the city of Vienna. John Sobieski the king of Poland rushed to the help of his Habsburg brother in faith, relieved the beleaguered city and turned back the tide of Turkish conquest. From this dates the decay of the Ottoman Empire. It was due as much to foreign disasters as to internal causes.

Decay of the Ottoman Empire :

The Ottoman Empire suffered from all the defects of absolute monarchy, polygamy, slavery, and static character of the government. Turkey was an alien power and she could never secure for good the good will of her European subjects, who were all Christians. Lack of toleration and oppression rendered all chances of reconciliation entirely remote. Unfortunately for Turkey, her decline was synchronous with the rise of a great neighbouring power, namely Russia. In order to gain an outlet into the Mediterranean, Russia from the middle of the 18th century began to take an active interest in the affairs of the Balkan Peninsula. In 1774, by the treaty of Kutchuk-Kainarji, Russia exacted from Turkey the following concessions—(1) right of navigation in Black Sea for commercial purposes, (2) protectorate over Christians in Turkey, (3) acquisition of Azov. This was a distinct encroachment upon the sovereignty of the Ottoman Empire. During the Napoleonic wars Alexander I, the Czar of Russia, stipulated by the treaty of Tilsit for the acquisition of Moldavia and Wallachia. This was however not realised. Napoleon by his expedition to Egypt also served to emphasise the importance of the Near East in the history of the world. The Serbians were the first Christian subject-nationality to rise in revolt (1804). The Serbs attained complete self government in 1830. In the mean time, a more important nationality, the Greeks, had also risen in revolt.

The details of the Greek War of Independence have been described in an earlier section. (See section on "Smaller Countries" in the part dealing with Europe.) The successful termination of the Greek War of Independence strengthened the influence of Russia in the Near East. The principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia were placed under the protectorate of Russia; Georgia and other provinces of the Caucasus were surrendered to Russia and Russian consuls were granted exclusive jurisdiction over Russian traders in Turkey.

Russia's interests in the Near East:

Both Geography and History—physical features and traditions—compelled Russia to meddle in the Balkans. On the north, Russia has the cold frigid waters of the Arctic—waters absolutely useless for trading purposes or for naval manœuvres. Before Russia emerged out of her mediæval seclusion and barbarism, Prussia under the Hohenzollerns and Sweden under the Vasas had already become powerful states. Thus the Baltic Sea was for Russia a Nordic lake. On the south there is the Black Sea; as Turkey was no longer a formidable power, well could Russia poke her nose in this direction. After acquiring the Northern coasts of the Black Sea, Russia, however, realised that for purposes of war and trade the Black Sea was not sufficient and she must gain control over the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles to reach the

Mediterranean. Thus from the beginning of the 19th century, the destruction of the Ottoman Empire became the alpha and omega of Russia's foreign policy. Traditions also connected Russia with the Christian peoples of the Turkish Empire. The semi-savage Russians received Christianity and civilization by coming in contact with the peoples of the Eastern Roman Empire, whose citadel was Constantinople. Thus well could the Russians pay back this debt in the 19th century by coming to the rescue of the oppressed nationalities. The 18th century Romanovs posed as the champions of the Greek church and the 19th century Russian diplomats rediscovered racial affinities between the Russians and the non-Greek European subjects of Turkey. The Crimean war was one such episode in which Russia pretended to be the saviour of the oppressed nationalities. (Details of the Crimean War are to be found in section on Russia).

Results of the Crimean War :

The parties involved in the war were Turkey backed by France, Great Britain and Sardinia fighting against Russia alone. By the treaties of Paris (1856), the right of Russia to protect the Christians in Turkey was denied. Russian protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia was abolished; the free navigation of the Danube was secured; and the Black Sea was neutralised, no vessels of war were to

enter it and no arsenals were to be established on its shores. Thus Russian encroachments were arrested.

The Crimean War was fought, as far as the allied powers were concerned, ostensibly to maintain the independence and integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Whatever might have been the motives of the western powers who ran to the rescue of the Moslem Empire, the war certainly secured a new lease of life to the Empire. The Sultan was to have his chance free from all interference, friendly or otherwise, to put his house in order and he could enter upon his task with renewed self-respect as Turkey was allowed to participate in the public law and international system of Europe.

To Russia, the war brought bitter disappointment if not profound humiliation. This was however of great use in exposing the inefficiency of the despotic government at home. The disasters of the Crimean War landed Russia in a period of liberal experiments. (See section on Russia).

The neutralisation of the Black Sea was of special concern to England as the leading naval power in the world. Fifteen years after, Russia, however, got this clause revoked by a clever stroke of diplomacy. But what was of great importance to Britain was that this restored the balance of power in the Near East. But the disasters which Britain suffered cast reflections on the prestige, military strategy and prowess of John Bull. Among the less known, but

more potent influences which culminated in the Indian Mutiny (1857) was the Crimean War.

The Crimean War saved the Roumanian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia from the clutches of the Russian Bear. Under the nominal suzerainty of Turkey, these two principalities steadily grew in strength and prestige and ultimately united as Roumania in 1869. The Congress of Berlin (1878) formally recognised its complete independence.

France did not gain much from this war. It merely served to strengthen the position and influence of Louis Napoleon.

The greatest gainer by the war excepting Turkey was Italy. Italy was made out of the mud in the trenches of Crimea. The intervention of Sardinia in the Crimean War gave to her a place in the concert of Europe and gave to her the right as well as the opportunity to champion the cause of Italian liberation. The Congress of Paris saw the Emperor Napoleon coming to an understanding with the Sardinian minister Cavour. This understanding ripened into the pact of Plombiers (1858) which bore fruit in the war of 1859 when Lombardy was liberated.

German unity also cannot deny its debt to Crimean War. Prussia by her benevolent neutrality contributed much to the early successes of Russia. Russia did not forget this service. When Prussia under Bismarck was uniting the Germans by means of "Blood and Iron" Russia always remained neutral.

This rendered the task of Prussia simple to a great extent in 1864, 1866 and 1870.

Thus the Crimean War constitutes a landmark in the history of Europe as much as in the history of the Near East.

[Ever since the British pacifist statesman John Bright's description of the Crimean War as "the nation's crime", opinions have differed regarding Britain's necessity of entering into the war. The question has been put again and again: Was the matter at issue worth a war? Expediency certainly urged Britain to support the alien Asiatic power. The newly won empire of India could be preserved and consolidated only by propping up a buffer state in the Near East. Russian designs in the East, if ever to be arrested, could not but be arrested better than by checking her on the Bosphorus. "To prevent the Russians from becoming the masters of Constantinople and the Dardanelles, from employing Greek sailors in their navy and then at their will commanding the route of India through Egypt" seemed a worthy British object. To this imperialistic motive was added the desire to save the independence of the nascent nationalities. Had Britain stood aloof, the tragedy of Poland and Ukraine would have been repeated in Roumania and Bulgaria. Certainly but for Anglo-French intervention, the fate of the Balkan States would have been the same as that of Korea and Manchuria in our times. So the altruistic

motives combined with the imperialistic instincts urged Britain to fight against Russia. The nascent nationalities through their conduct later on proved beyond doubt that they wanted "to breathe free air and not through Russian nostrils."]

The Kingdom of Roumania :

For the next 20 years, the Eastern Question did not seriously threaten the peace of Europe. Nevertheless, it soon became evident that many important problems connected with it were still unsolved. The people of Mololavia and Wallachia were eager to incorporate the two provinces into one kingdom. By the peace of Paris, Russian protectorate over the two Principalities had been removed and they were placed on a semi-independent status. There was however some opposition from Powers of Europe as regards the proposal of union. In 1858, a European Congress decreed that Moldavia and Wallachia should remain separate though virtually independent. But the representative assemblies of the two principalities refused to be outmanœuvred in this way, and both the assemblies elected Alexander John Cuza, a native noble man as their prince (1859). The Powers reluctantly recognised the fait accompli and on the eve of Christmas, 1861, the union of the principalities was formally proclaimed. The united kingdom was named Roumania, and Bucharest became the capital. Prince Cuza ruled from 1859 to

1866. He was a very efficient and liberal ruler, but his reforms created enemies on all sides. In February, 1866, he was deposed. The crown was then offered to Prince Charles of the Hohenzollern family, who accepted the offer. Charles I was primarily a soldier, and he built up a strong army so as to make Roumania entirely independent of Russian or Turkish patronage. Under the influence of his talented wife he discarded German habits and manners and soon became very popular. He granted a constitution based on the Belgian model. He developed agriculture, industry, and railways. King Charles (Carol) died in 1914.

Insurrections in the Balkans 1875-76 :

The expectation of the Allies that the Sultan would ameliorate the lot of his Christian subjects failed entirely. The Sultan who had secured a place in the concert of Europe did not show any sign of change of heart. Turkish officials carried on the old traditions of oppression and mal-administration. The oppression of the Turks ultimately provoked the peasants of Herzegovina to rise in insurrection. They were very soon joined by the fellow Slavs of Bosnia (1875). Next year the Christians of Bulgaria raised the standard of insurrection and killed a number of Turkish officials. Fearful revenge was taken by the Turks. With cool calculated brutality, the Bulgarians were tortured and slaugh-

tered. Children and women did not escape the ruthless savagery of the Bashibajouks, the ferocious irregulars called to service. All Europe was thrilled with horror. William Gladstone, the great English Liberal statesman prescribed the following remedy. "Let the Turks now carry away their abuses in the only possible manner—namely by carrying off themselves. Their Zaptiehs and their Mudirs, their Bimbashis, and their Yuzbashis, their Kaimakams, and their Pashas, one and all, bag and baggage, shall, I hope, clear out from the province they have desolated and profaned." Serbia and Montenegro declared war against Turkey (July 1876). About a year later Russia came to the rescue of the fellow Slavs. This led to the Russo-Turkish war which we have discussed in the section on Russia. Russia secured very advantageous terms by the treaty of San Stephano, But due to the opposition of the then Conservative ministry of Britain, the issues had to be re-settled at a European Congress held at Berlin (July 1878).

Treaty of Berlin:

The Berlin Congress settled the Balkan issues in the following manner. Serbia, Montenegro and Roumania received small accessions of territory and were declared independent of Turkey. Bulgaria was divided into three principalities: (i) Bulgaria proper which was to be an indepen-

dent state under Turkish suzerainty; (ii) Eastern Roumelia was restored to the Sultan on condition that a Christian governor would administer it; and (iii) Macedonia was handed over to Turkey. Russia acquired Batum and Kars and regained Rumanian Bessarabia which she had lost by the Crimean War. In order to offset Russia's gains, Bosnia and Herzegovina were handed over to Austria for occupation and administration under Turkish suzerainty. England for her "good offices" was rewarded by the cession of Cyprus.

Criticism of the Treaty of Berlin:

Like the Congress of Vienna, the Berlin Congress made a terrible mistake in ignoring the principle of nationality. The representatives of the Balkan nations were not invited and naturally, the issues had to be decided *ex parte*. Bulgaria was partitioned much against the wishes of the Bulgarians. Herzegovina and Bosnia did not feel any improvement in their lot. Seven years after the treaty of Berlin, Eastern Roumelia united with Bulgaria proper. The Austrian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as we shall find later, endangered the international peace.

The treaty failed to bolster up the ramshackle Turkish Empire. Neither protected nor corrected by Britain, Turkey was enabled to repeat the horrors of Bulgaria on an aggravated scale in Armenia

(1894-95). Nationalist movements took full advantage of the growing incapacity and administrative chaos of the Ottoman Empire.

Checked on the Bosphorus, Russia concentrated on exploring avenues of expansion in the Middle and the Far East. The Berlin Congress confirmed the verdict of the Crimean War and Russia definitely abjured all ambitions in the Near East. Russian agents henceforth roamed in the bazaars of Central Asia and on the coasts of the Pacific. This constituted a fresh source of danger to the British Empire in India. Yet curiously enough, the early years of the twentieth century proved that Turkey rather than Russia constituted the real danger for the integrity of the British Empire in the East. We shall find later on how the problem of Khilafat and the adventures of Kaiser William II compelled the British Lion to woo the hands of the Russian Bear.

In defence of British conduct in 1878 it may be said that events in the East developed for good or evil on lines widely divergent from those visible at the time.

It has also been pointed out that as a result of the Treaty, European Turkey was greatly reduced and the three Balkan states long in process of formation, Montenegro, Servia and Roumania, were declared entirely independent and a new state Bulgaria had been called into existence though

still slightly subject to the Porte. The treaty thus secured the emancipation of about eleven million Christians.

Withdrawal of British Patronage :

Turkey, the sickman of Europe, had been enjoying British patronage and protection from the time of Greek War of Independence. France was the first European power to evince any interest in the affairs of the Ottoman Empire. Britain, upto the end of the 18th century, had never taken any lively interest in the Near East. William Pitt was the first British statesman to display any interest in what to his successors in Downing Street became known as the Eastern Question. It was Napoleon who compelled the British statesmen to turn their gaze in this direction. The Nile expedition of Napoleon, though a failure, revealed the fact that any great power dominating the Near East would turn the flank on the British Empire in the East. This explains the almost consistent support given by Britain to Turkey against Russian menace. This explains the British grip over Egypt still after formal independence has been granted to Egypt. But from 1878, Britain slowly but steadily began to withdraw her patronage. The British occupation of Cyprus and the Liberal Premier Gladstone's policy made Turkey lose confidence in British support any further. The British occupation of Egypt in 1882

and British sympathies towards the victims of Armenia (1894-96) confirmed the growing estrangement between Britain and Turkey. So there was a vacancy in the patronage of the Ottoman Empire and this vacancy was filled up, by Kaiser William II.

The Kaiser's adventures in the Near East :

German interference in the East began with the dropping of the old pilot, Prince Bismarck. After the completion of German union, Bismarck declared that Germany was satiated. He strongly resented the launching of any colonial programme. His prophetic vision made him clearly realise that with a hostile neighbour in the west, Germany should not get into the complications of the *Welt Politik*. Bismarck was particularly apathetic towards the affairs of the Near East. "I never take the trouble to open the mail bag from Constantinople" was the shrewd statement of the Iron Chancellor who bluntly declared, "The whole of the Balkans is not worth the bones of a single Promeranian grenadier." Soon after the pilot was doopped, a new orientation in the foreign policy of the German Empire took place. And curiously enough the young emperor of Germany decided to make the domination of the Near East, the keystone of German *welt politik*.

In 1881, a band of German officers was lent to Turkey for the reorganisation of the army. In the wake of German soldiers came traders and financiers,

scholars and tourists, and very soon an average German became keenly interested in the affairs of the Near East. In 1889, the Kaiser, accompanied by his wife, paid a visit to Sultan Abdul Hamid. The visit was repeated in 1898. This time however the Kaiser made an extensive tour in the Ottoman Empire. He made a pilgrimage to the holy land of the Christians and the British tourist agency, Messrs. Thomas Cook & Son, were in charge of this tour. At Damascus, the Kaiser assured the Muhammadans dwelling in all parts of the East that the German emperor will be their friend at all times. Such a statement could not be overlooked by France and Britain whose colonial possessions counted innumerable Muhammadans. During this sojourn important railway concessions were secured from the Sultan. German traders backed by the Kaiser made a plan of connecting Bagdad with Bosphorus by means of a railway so that Berlin and Bagdad could be negotiated by an overland route via Bosphorus. In 1902, a convention was concluded for the construction of a railway line from Constantinople to Bagdad. The plan however could not materialise due to the refusal of a pro-British Emir on the coasts of the Persian Gulf. Thwarted in this direction, the German traders began to construct lines on the north-western side of Arabia. These railway projects seriously threatened the existence of the British Empire in the East. Had the Berlin-Bagdad

Railway scheme materialised it would have turned the flank of the British Empire, just as in the 15th century, Portugal by the discovery of the Cape route to India turned the flank of the Ottoman Turks. (Marriott)

Thus the net result of German adventures in the Near East was the estrangement of the two Teutonic powers. Let it be said however in defence of the much maligned unfortunate Kaiser William II that Germany was merely following the tradition set up by other Western powers. After passing through those scientific and agricultural changes known as the Industrial Revolution, every Western country began the search for markets in Asia and Africa. It was natural that the Germans whose talents as scientists and organisers have not yet been surpassed by any other nation should follow the lead of Britain or France in *welt politik*. The domination of the Near East was essential in capturing the market here, specially as there was a "vacancy." The Kaiser's guilt lies in this that he was a reckless adventurer and knew not that his frothy utterances would create more enemies than friends.

The Habsburg Empire and the Near East :

By the second half of the 19th Century, the Habsburg Empire also felt itself vitally interested in the Balkans. With the rise of Prussia under the Hohenzollerns from the middle of the 18th Century,

Austria gradually lost her predominant position in Germany. When in 1785, Frederick II, the Prussian King, frustrated the plans of the Austrian Emperor Joseph II to exchange Austrian Netherlands (Belgium) for Bavaria, Habsburg statesman realised that Austrian expansion henceforth must be in the South East. And when almost a hundred years after, Bismarck's blood and iron policy drove Austria bag and baggage out of Germany, Austria was forced to accept *Drang nach Osten* (Drive to the East) as the mission of her foreign policy. Habsburg desire to expand in the Eastern direction was not inspired by motives of imperial aggrandisement only, it was partly dictated by motives of 'self preservation'. If Russia surrounded on the North by the cold frigid waters of the Arctic, could hanker after the warm waters of the Mediterranean, Austria checked in the North could well aspire for extending her Adriatic seaboard into the Mediterranean. Thus she came into conflict with Serbia. The Slavs had a glorious past and were then dreaming of a glorious future. Serbia was champion of a Pan-Slavonic movement which aspired for the union of all the Slavonic peoples in the Habsburg and the Ottoman Empires. Thus Habsburg imperialism and Pan-Slav nationalism faced each other in the Balkans and none could yield to other.

By the treaty of Berlin (1878) the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina were handed over to

Austria-Hungary for occupation and administration. In 1908 there was a revolution at Constantinople. This revolution engineered by the progressive elements known as the 'Young Turks' was successful in controlling the despotic government. Austria took advantage of this incident and formally annexed the two provinces. This annexation was a serious blow to Serbian ambitions. But as Russia, the patron of Serbia, was exhausted due to the disasters she had met with at the hands of Japan (1904-5), Serbia could not do much against Austria supported by Kaiser William II. As a compensation to Turkey, Austria paid her an indemnity and withdrew her garrisons from the Sanzak of Novibazar. Curiously enough this piece of aggrandizement far from wounding the feelings of Turkey hurt Serbia more than Turkey. To Turkey, the loss of these two provinces was perhaps a good riddance from the unhappy task of administering hostile subjects; to Serbia, it meant the substitution of an effective alien control in place of an ineffective alien suzerainty in two Slav provinces.

References :

Marriott: The Eastern Question.

Rose: Development of European Nations.

Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy,
Vol. 2.

THE YOUNG TURKS AND THE BALKAN WARS

The Young Turks:

The disasters of the 19th century which led to the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire spelt ruin for the prestige of the government at Constantinople. Naturally the intelligentsia of the Turks sought for the reasons of Turkish disasters and found a remedy in reforming the government. The zeal for reform was most marked among the educated youths. In 1891, a committee, afterwards known as the Young Turks, was formed at Geneva. The programme of the Young Turks had the following objects in view: to transform the Ottoman Empire into a modern European State; to give Turkey a parliamentary constitution; to emancipate the press; to proclaim the principles of religious liberty; to encourage education; and to do away with all the relics of medievalism. The movement, though conducted from Geneva, was a great success among the youths and cadets in the army. In 1906, the society removed its head quarters from Geneva to Salonika. The Sultan Abdul Hamid II had in 1876 under the influence of the liberal Midhat Pasha promised a liberal constitution, but afterwards proved treacherous and reactionary. On July 23, 1908, the Young Turks with the support of a section of the army

proclaimed the constitution of 1876. Abdul Hamid conceded the demand, summoned a parliament and promised equality of rights to all his subjects irrespective of race or creed. Within a year, Abdul Hamid again proved a traitor and tried to effect a counter-revolution. This led to his deposition on 27th April, 1909. The Turkish National Assembly meeting at Constantinople proclaimed Hamid's brother Sultan under the style of Mohamed V.

A section among the Young Turks proud of the achievements of Ottomans in the past and eager to prove again the superiority of the Turks, very soon gained control and launched a policy of Turkification of all the non-Turkish elements. Like the German and Russian Kultur movements in Poland and elsewhere, this Turkish Kultur movement made the Young Turks very unpopular in the eyes of the liberals throughout Europe. The new Turkish government was to them a modern edition of the preceding one.

But the Young Turks were not strong enough to check the losses of the Empire, the losses suffered during the Revolution.

Taking advantage of the revolution Ferdinand, King of Bulgaria, renounced the suzerainty of the Sultan and declared himself the Czar of Bulgaria. The Habsburg government which had been in undisputed occupation of the two provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1878, followed suit by annexing

them permanently. Greece also refused to miss this opportunity and declared in favour of annexation of Crete. The new government of Turkey had to recognise the independence of Bulgaria and the Habsburg annexation of the two provinces. Crete was formally annexed by Greece in 1913.

The Turko-Italian War, 1911:

Italy had nursed for a long time designs regarding Tripoli. The acquisition of Tripoli was necessary not merely for economic exploitation, but mainly for its strategic importance to Italy as a Mediterranean power. Austria's bold example taught Italy to consider the time as now or never. In September, 1911, Italy invaded Lybia and within a year forced Turkey to relinquish Tripoli. (Treaty of Lausanne 1912.) This war proved the military weakness of the new government and inspired fresh hopes in the minds of the Christian peoples under Turkey.

The Balkans Wars, 1912-1913:

After negotiations running over a number of years, Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece, and Montenegro entered into an entente to resist attacks made by Turkey upon any of the signatory powers and made for "common action" against Turkey. In October 1912, Montenegro, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece launched war against Turkey. The Turkish Empire was thus assailed on various fronts. Serbia

and Bulgaria inflicted crushing defeats and by November, Bulgarian soldiers reached Tchataldja lines of fortifications, only 25 miles from Constantinople. The collapse of the Ottoman power was complete by December and the Porte was willing to enter into negotiations. A conference of the belligerent powers held in London failed due to Bulgaria's demand of Adrianople. The war was resumed in March, 1913 and the Balkan nations were equally successful this time. Jannina fell on March 6, Adrianople on March 26, and Scutari on April 23. Turkey was brought to knees. By the treaty of London, May 30, 1913, Turkey lost all territories west of a laid down line from Midia on the Black Sea to the Aegean. The territories were to pass to the Balkan powers. Crete was also ceded to the great powers for settlement of its claims to be united with Greece. Crete was incorporated in the kingdom of Greece. in December, 1913. The great powers *recognised Albania as an autonomous State.*

Serbia, eager for an outlet to the sea, found her way blocked by the institution of autonomous Albania. Serbian efforts to seek compensation in Macedonia met with rebuff from Bulgaria. Bulgaria and Serbia disputed each other's claims over the spoils of the war and very soon, war broke out (June, 1913) among the victors of the last war. Bulgaria had to fight against Serbia, Greece and Roumania. The Turks to wreck vengeance on Bulgaria sided with

Serbia. Bulgarians were compelled to make peace. By the treaty of Bucharest (August, 1913), Bulgaria ceded north western Bulgaria to Roumania and abandoned claims over considerable portions of Macedonia to Greece, Serbia and Montenegro. By a separate treaty with Turkey, Bulgaria had to give up Adrianople and a part of Thrace to Turkey.

The Results of the Balkan Wars:

Thus the Balkan Wars led to the shrinkage of the Ottoman Empire. The insurgent nationalism which had been denied any voice in Berlin conference of 1878 now took upon itself the task of partitioning the legacy of the sickman.

Among the Balkan powers, Greece was the greatest gainer. She had secured Salonika, part of Thessaly, and the whole of the Aegean coast. Thanks to the diplomacy of Venizelos, Crete, the cradle of the Greek civilization, was now incorporated into the kingdom of Greece. The most disgruntled victor was however Serbia. Serbia's ambition to be a sea-power could not be fulfilled due to the institution of autonomous Albania.

The Balkan Wars however proved that there was really no community of interests among the Christian powers. The only issue on which they were agreed was the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire; but there was no agreement on the more important issue of the division of the inheritance from the sick man.

The wars proved that the Balkan problem was not a problem of local interest. Austria and Italy were bent upon land-locking Serbia, because Serbian expansion would be dangerous to both of them. Russia on the other hand sympathised with Serbian expansion at the cost of other Balkan states.

The wars confirmed the change in the outlook of Britain and France. German influence in Turkey led to a volte-face in British foreign policy. Britain silently sympathised with Serbia. France as an ally of Britain and as a prospective enemy of Germany also followed British attitude. Henceforth the Russian bear was no longer a bugbear to Britain and France.

The unsatiated Serbian ambition and the pro-Serbian attitude of Russia, France and Britain pointed to the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire as the true solution of the Balkan problem.

Hence the Balkan question became an international problem. The last War (1914) was from one point of view a war to complete the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire and the realisation of the ambitions of the rival nascent states. From the opposite point of view it was a war to preserve the integrity of the Turkish and the Habsburg Empires.

References:

Marriott: The Eastern Question.

Marriott: Europe and Beyond.

Rose: Development of European Nations.

THE OPENING OF CHINA

“The modern history of the Far Eastern countries begins with the drawing of these states from their long continued seclusion into contact with the Occidental world. This history has been shaped in large part by outside forces, the operation of which in each case has resulted in a modification of ancient cultures and long established and firmly rooted institutions.” (Vinacke)

China in 1815:

At the time of the beginning of the contact of the East with the West, that is, the beginning of the forcible intrusion of the West into the East, China consisted of: (1) China proper; (2) Manchuria (now transformed into the Japanese hegemony of Manchukuo); (3) dependencies as Tibet, Sinkiang (Turkestan) and Mongolia, over which at present China has no effective control; and (4) nominally vassal states like Korea (now a province in Japanese Empire) and Annam (now a French protectorate). At the beginning of the nineteenth century China counted more than three hundred and fifty million souls. Various racial stocks contributed to the formation of the Chinese. Buddhism (or rather a corrupted form of Buddhism) and Confucianism were the main religions while Islam also counted a large number of believers specially in Sinkiang. The family was the basis

of the social organisation and ancestor-worship was a strong feature of pre-modern China. At the head of the Empire was the Manchu Emperor. The Imperial dynasty had been originally a foreign house on the soil of China. By the middle of the 17th century, the Manchus who came from Manchuria, conquered China and the Manchu King became the Emperor. The Emperor was a despot who ruled by divine right. The limitations on the absolute power of the Emperor were many, but it is doubtful how far the 'Chinese limited monarchy' could answer to the Western constitutional monarchy. The control exercised by the Emperor over the viceroys was a matter of personal equation.

Causes of Seclusion:

As pointed out, at the beginning of the 19th century China was a *terra incognita* to most people, particularly to those of the West. An average educated European's knowledge of China was derived from the pages of Marco Polo, who visited China in the 13th century. During the middle ages China had not shut its doors upon the foreigners. Her shyness dated from about the middle of the 18th century. The whole Empire was closed to foreigners except for peepholes at Canton and Macao. The reasons of Chinese hostility are worth investigating as they cast much reflections upon the character of European traders. The phenomenon of the Father, the Shop-

keeper and the Tommy coming in succession was a commonplace affair in the East. The stories of the activities of the Portuguese missionaries in India, the impertinent attitude of the French and British traders in India, the aggressions of the Dutch and the Spanish in the East Indies and the Philippines must have reached Peking. That these tales were not exaggerated was revealed by the behaviour of the first arrivals in China. By an edict of 16th century foreigners had been permitted to trade at all the coast ports and the Roman Catholic missionaries were tolerated. But the questionable zeal of these missionaries led to the passing of an edict in 1724 by which Christianity was proscribed; and yet in 1820 there were six bishops, twenty-three foreign missionaries, eighty native priests and 215,000 converts. The government was struck with the amazing success of the secret work of the missionaries. The conduct of the traders was also not helpful. So in 1757 the whole Empire was closed to foreigners except at Canton and Macao. "Thus a survey of the first two centuries of Occidental contact with China reveals the fact that it was experience and experiment rather than innate hostility to foreigners which resulted in the closing of the Empire." (Vinacke)

The Canton Trade:

Hence from 1757 the foreign traders would visit Canton only. They were not permitted to reside there throughout the year. They of course

made representations for further concessions. But as the Western ambassadors refused to comply with the Chinese custom of performing *Kowtow* (the nine prostrations before the Emperor or his image) these representations failed. Europe and U. S. A. had needs for the tea and silk of China but China uptil the beginning of our period had no such necessity of foreign trade. The Chinese Emperor bluntly pointed out to George III of Britain; "I set no value on objects strange or ingenidus, and I have no use for your country's manufactures."

Just on the eve of the Manchu conquest opium had been introduced into China by the Dutch. The Chinese became addicted to opium as an intoxicant. It very soon became a national vice. Edicts had been passed against it without avail. A few years after the conquest of Bengal, the British traders began to import Indian opium into China. It was a convenient article, practically the only one for which there was Chinese demand. And the demand was stimulated by the active supply. In 1800 trade in opium was categoricallay prohibited. But smuggling continued due to the dishonesty of Chinese officials and the business instincts of the foreign traders. The situation attained its climax in 1838.

During the 18th century, and still more since the days of Wellesley in India, a practical monopoly

of the opium trade had fallen to the English East India Company. It yielded to the English Company an annual profit of about one million pound. The edicts of the Chinese government had not seriously affected this lucrative trade due to smuggling. By the Charter of 1833 the monopoly of East India Company was put an end to. Hence, to get a share in this lucrative traffic independent traders began to flock to Canton. They were determined to inherit the legacy of the East India Company. The Chinese government, on the other hand, was no longer prepared to find its edicts flouted. In 1838, the Emperor appointed an able officer named Lin Tzu-Hsu a special commissioner to deal with the opium question, authorising him to enforce edicts. Lin demanded that the foreign traders should give up all the opium in their possession and give a bond not to engage in the traffic in future. The English were prepared to surrender the opium in their possession, but refused to give the required bond. The British traders were stopped of their supplies of food, water and personal service. They had to withdraw and settle at Honkong. The Americans accepted a modified form of the bond and were allowed to carry on lawful trade. But very soon, the English traders resumed the traffic through the Americans. The Chinese were exasperated and very soon war broke out.

The Opium War and its Significance:

From the Chinese point of view, the sole question at issue was that of the importation of opium, so that their case rested on high ethical grounds. From the English standpoint, it was a war to establish sound commercial relations between two sovereign states. According to English traders, confinement of trade to only one port was against the fundamental principles of international trade, and the Opium War was merely an episode to secure recognition of the claims of true international trade. The British government, be it said to its credit, never questioned the right of China to prohibit opium, though it never took any active steps to check smuggling.

The quarrel was a sordid one. It lasted for nearly 3 years and consisted of a number of easy victories for the British. The Chinese navy, if it could be at all called a navy, was no match against British squadrons and the Chinese military defences were wholly inadequate. Hongkong was occupied, Shanghai easily fell, assault was made on Nanking, and Peking was threatened. The Chinese, however, fought with courage, worth emulating, but it was useless. The Emperor was at last brought to terms.

By the treaty of Nanking (1842), China ceded Hongkong to Britain and agreed to pay an indemnity of \$21,000,000. Besides Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai were to be opened to foreign trade. It was also agreed that British

officials should communicate on terms of equality with Chinese mandarins of equal rank.

It is significant that the treaty was silent concerning what was, from the Chinese point of view, the chief issue of the war. "The main principle that the treaty of Nanking was intended to proclaim was the equality of Great Britain with China. Hitherto the Chinese had assumed a superiority over all the natives of the earth. 'There is only sun in the heavens and and there is only one Emperor on earth' was the common answer to any claims of equality, that was put forward by the outer barbarians." (Douglas) The Chinese vanity was rudely disturbed and China, hitherto accustomed to domination over the Mongols and the Anamis, found a power to reckon with. The success of Britain was the success of Western civilisation over Eastern, but the implications were not yet grasped by China.

China adopts "Open Door" principle:

After the humiliation in the Opium War China very cleverly avoided the fate of being exploited by Britain alone. At the instance of the American Commodore, Kearny, she threw open all the five ports to the nationals of all the trading powers. In 1844, U. S. A. entered into a treaty with China. In this treaty the principle of extra-territoriality was explicitly incorporated. By this concession the American residents in China were placed under the jurisdiction

of the American code to be administered by the American consul or other properly constituted authorities. This was a very obnoxious privilege conceded by a sovereign state. But China, in order to avoid swallowing up by Britain, hastened to win the friendship of U. S. A. France quickly followed suit; the French envoy even secured permission for Roman Catholic missionaries to build churches in the treaty ports. The native Christians were henceforth tolerated. The Emperor very soon extended this concession to Protestant missionaries also. Thus it was evident that the treaty of Nanking and the succeeding treaties "inserted the opening wedge for the development of direct intercourse between the outside world and China." But the vanity of the Peking government was not yet entirely removed, and relations between the foreigners and the Chinese officials were yet far from satisfactory. Foreigners found that the Chinese officials were failing to give effect to the spirit of the treaties. Foreign traders were eager to have them revised, whereas the officials of Canton stoutly resisted any such proposal. The situation was made worse by the Jingoistic conduct of Palmerston, British Foreign Minister, and Napoleon III of France.

The Second China War (1857-58):

In 1855 a French missionary was murdered and in 1856, a boat owned by the Chinese but flying the English flag, the *Arrow*, had been captured. This led

to a joint Anglo-French expedition into the very heart of the country. Though British activities were somewhat delayed by the occurrence of the Mutiny in India, China was easily brought to terms. The Chinese government was also handicapped due to a civil war within the country. The Summer Palace of the Emperor was looted and subsequently consigned to the flames by Anglo-French troops. Thus very favourable concessions could be wrung from the Emperor.

The Tientsin Treaties:

The negotiations, started at Tientsin in 1858, were brought to an end in 1861. By the terms of the new treaties eleven new ports—in addition to the five—were opened to foreign trade; Kowloon was ceded to Britain; and a large indemnity was paid to France and England; the river Yangtse was opened to navigation up to Hankow; diplomatic representatives were allowed to reside in Peking, and protection was promised for missionaries in the interior. The importation of opium was legalised and the right of extra-territoriality was conceded.

The Second China War confirmed the verdict of the First China War (Opium War), namely the superiority of Western methods of warfare over those of the Heavenly Empire. China was compelled to acknowledge not only the equality, but in some respects the superiority, of the Westerners. Yet

China was slow to adopt the essential features of Western civilisation.

Causes of Chinese hostility towards Western Culture:

China's hesitancy in accepting the ideas and practices of the west was caused by a variety of reasons. The humiliating fact that she had to open her doors under compulsion created the feeling that the acceptance of Western culture would add insult to injury. Secondly, the mere fact of military success did not cause the Chinese to lose their feeling of superiority. On many occasions in the past, foreign arms had been successful against them, but in the long run the Chinese race had proved invincible. This consideration helps to explain the reluctance of the Chinese to recognise the superiority of the material civilisation of the West, as also to realise that their own civilisation was a spent force.

In spite of their traditional contempt for outsiders, a considerable number of Chinese began to admire the Westerners and their habits. Chinese boys were sent abroad for education and a college on Western model was established in Peking. Americans took the leading part in educating the Chinese boys and towards the end of the 19th century, a large number of students graduated from American universities.

In order to conduct foreign affairs better, a board called the Tsungli Yamen was founded in 1861. Though it failed to work like its sister institutions in

the West, its establishment was an indication of a changing outlook. It showed that the Peking government was no longer prepared to have its policy flouted by mandarins or to work on unauthorised information.

Government also recognised that the native army, organised and equipped on traditional lines, was not fit even to deal with internal troubles. During the long drawn-out Taiping Rebellion, the government had to accept foreign aid.

Taiping Rebellion (1851-1864):

The Taiping was a semi-religious, semi-political movement directed against the Manchu dynasty. The movement was started by an ambitious and talented youth named Hung Siu-Chuen. He founded a religion which had in it many elements of Christianity. Persecution drove him to work for founding a new regime to be known as the Taiping (perfect peace) dynasty. The movement was very strong in the south, and Nanking was its headquarters. The movement could not be crushed as the Peking government was involved in hostilities with Britain and France (1857-58). After the Second China War was over, the imperial government directed its attention towards the crushing of the movement with greater vigour. In 1859, the commander of the government forces secured the services of an American named Frederick Ward and very soon its progress was checked. After the death of Ward in 1862, an English captain named

Gordon (the same general who later on fought and perished in Egypt) took the command. By 1864, the rebellion was entirely suppressed.

The rebellion is important not in itself but in its effects. The Taiping movement failed because it was mainly a destructive and not a constructive movement. In the constitutional history of the country, the movement ranks important for bringing to notice the corrupt and weak character of the imperial government, as also its oppressive nature. But the most important effect of the rebellion was the introduction of foreigners in the finance department. The movement resulted in a total stoppage of revenue from many of the greatest revenue-producing areas in the country for a number of years. On account of the war with Britain and France which accentuated the internal troubles, the imperial administration soon became disorganised, and there was no authority at Shanghai for collection of the customs. A foreign service was organised for temporary purposes and this was later taken over by the Chinese government as one of its own departments. Two Englishmen, Lay and Hart, were in succession placed at the head of the customs. Due to the ability, honesty and loyalty of Hart, the foreign-administered Chinese-Maritime-Customs was retained. The administration of the department by foreigners has been a mixed blessing in the financial system of China.

But the suppression of the Taiping Rebellion did

not give the Peking government any power to prevent the dismemberment of the Empire which had been going on since the middle of the century.

Loss of China's Dependencies :

Checked on the Bosphorus and in Afghanistan, Russia in search of an ice-free port was tempted to take advantage of China's weakness. In 1853, Russia secured a large piece of territory down to the Amur river. Two years later she secured a long coastline on the north of Korea; Vladivostok was built on this coast line. In 1875, after a long dispute with Japan, Russia annexed the Island of Saghalin.

France under Napoleon III directed attention towards Indo-China. After a war with the king of Annam, Cochin China was handed over to France (1862). Next year, Cambodia was made a protectorate and within a few years, the conquest of Cochin China was completed. The Third Republic carried on the colonial policy of Napoleon III. During the last two decades of the 19th century, Annam and Tongking were brought within French colonial empire. The Peking government had to acknowledge the loss of its suzerainty over these territories (1885).

Great Britain, always careful "to preserve the balance of power" could not remain inactive. Tenasserim had been annexed during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Amherst in India. In 1852, during the Governor-Generalship of Lord Dalhousie,

Pegu was conquered and annexed to the Indian Empire. Upper Burma was annexed during the Viceroyalty of Lord Dufferin. After the neutrality of Siam had been secured, Britain found no necessity to encroach into the Empire of China. On two occasions, she had proved her superiority over the Chinese Empire and with her eastern frontiers well secured, she apprehended no encroachments upon her Indian Empire.

In spite of the losses of her dependencies and the victories of Western powers, the Western powers refrained from any attack upon China proper. It is not a wonder that the powers did not invade China as they did India. "The explanation lies in the wholesome respect that they had for the potential power of the Chinese Empire, in the fear that existed lest the "sleeping dragon" should be too rudely awakened and should turn and rend the disturbers of its peace", as also in the mutual rivalry of the powers themselves and U.S.A.'s friendly attitude towards China.

"It remained for an Asiatic state to reveal the actual helplessness of the Chinese Empire and to lessen the respect felt for its potential power." (Vinacke)

References :

Douglas : Europe and the Far East.

Vinacke : A History of the Far East in Modern Times.

FOREIGN IMPACT ON JAPAN

Like China, Japan also lived apart from the outside world until the middle of the 19th century, the reasons of her seclusion being similar to those of China. During the 16th century foreign traders and missionaries were permitted, but very soon the government of Japan realised that the increase of converts was a serious menace to the sovereignty of the state. The possibility of a double allegiance was apparent, appeals being preferred to the Pope as against the ruler of Japan. So in the 17th century, edicts were passed closing Japan to general foreign intercourse. The Dutch were however permitted a limited commercial intercourse through the port of Nagasaki. The Dutch being Protestants were not so much disliked as the Portuguese and Spaniards. Japan was again forced to open her doors in 1853. Before we proceed to deal with this incident, it is better to have some ideas of the land and its people.

The Land and its People :

Territorially the Japan of 1853 does not correspond to the Japanese Empire of our day. It then consisted of five large islands of Saghalin (which was not actively governed by them), Hokkaido, Hondo, Shikoku, Kiushiu, besides a number of smaller islands of which the Kurile Isles were foremost. The

country is generally mountainous. The mountains which run from the north to the south abound with volcanoes. Earthquakes are of frequent occurrence. The coast is fringed with inlets and promontories and possesses a number of good harbours. This has made the people sea-faring. The situation of the islands in the temperate zone and the presence of the warm ocean-current known as the Kuro-Siuo have secured a temperate bracing climate. As a result, the people are hardy and energetic. Flowers bloom luxuriantly. The cherry and plum trees, the chrysanthemum and the camellia have made the land a sort of paradise. No wonder the Japanese—lower and upper classes alike—are worshippers of beauty. They pay special attention to flowers and their aesthetic nature finds expression in the decoration of their household and in petty handiwork.

Though light hearted and pleasure-loving, the people are intensely patriotic and brave to a fault. Shinto-ism or the national religion of Japan commands, "Thou shalt honour the gods and love thy country."

Buddhism was introduced into Japan mainly from China, but it could not wholly displace the old faith of Shintoism.

Japan by the middle of the 19th century had a very curious system of government. At the head of the state stood the Mikado or the Emperor, but he

reigned without governing. He lived in seclusion at Kyoto and the actual power was in the hands of the Shogun (Generalissimo). From about the beginning of the 17th century the Shogunate had become hereditary in a particular family, Tokugawa. Like the prime ministers of Nepal, or the Peshwas of the Maratha kingdom, the Shoguns were the *de facto* rulers of the country while their masters enjoyed only nominal sovereignty. Just as the Peshwas in turn became weak and puppets in the hands of the rival houses of Holkar and Sindhia, the Shoguns by the middle of the last century had become puppets in the hands of their powerful feudal lords. The result was that a figurehead system of government ruled Japan and the common people suffered from what may be termed in Hindu political theory, *Matsya naya* (might is right). This situation was brought to an end in 1867. This political revolution was due to external events.

Coming of Commodore Perry :

As pointed out before, Japan from the 17th century lived a secluded life; the foreigners admitted were the Dutch and the Chinese. From the twenties of the 19th century many European nations attempted to establish commercial relations with Japan, but they were all unsuccessful. Growth of American foreign trade attracted the attention of the U. S. Government to Japan. If the Americans were to

develop direct communications with China by means of steamships, coaling stations or ports of call *en route* were indispensable. So in 1852, the Washington Government despatched an expedition under Commodore Perry. The Commodore was charged to secure the following: (1) protection of American shipwrecked sailors; (2) the opening of the ports for the entry of vessels to refit and obtain coal; and (3) the opening of ports for trade. Commodore Perry with four ships of war steamed into Yokohama Bay on July 3, 1853 disregarding all signals to stop. Perry delivered his demands to the government of Japan and made it clear that his mission was eminently pacific, adding that in case of the request being refused, he was determined to have his way. As the Japanese wanted time for consideration, Perry left Yokohama promising to return for an answer next year. He then withdrew to the China coast. After many and anxious councils, it was decided at Yedo (the capital of the Shogun) to adopt a friendly attitude towards the American Commodore. Perry returned in February 1854 with 4 more ships. He was well received this time and after prolonged negotiations, a treaty along the terms of his instructions was made. Nagasaki and two other ports were opened to foreign vessels for the purpose of coaling, provisioning and refitting; protection was assured to shipwrecked sailors and the right to appoint a consul was accorded. "The Perry treaty was the entering

wedge'' and England, Russia and Holland in succession secured similar concessions.

The Foreigners and the Dual System of government:

The opening of the country revealed the weakness of the Dual System of government. When they negotiated treaties with the government of Shogun, the foreign representatives thought that they were dealing with the nominal as well as the real government of the country. Later on, when disputes arose they hesitated to recognise the plea of the Shogun that he must refer the matter to Kyoto, thinking it an indication of bad faith and double-dealing on his part. On the other hand each reference to Mikado revealed more clearly to the Japanese themselves that the Shogun had upto now usurped the powers which belonged to the Mikado. The reasons for such conduct on the part of the Shogun were two-fold. The question of foreign relations was a question of great magnitude, and the Shogun naturally hastened to invoke imperial authority. Secondly, Tokugawa family which had captured the Shogunate in the early part of the 17th century was suffering from weak succession by the middle of the 19th century and the ruling Shogun had neither the courage nor the ability to deal with the foreigners alone. Unfortunately for him, the Mikado was at that time under the influence of the party hostile to the Shogun. The Mikado under their influence insisted upon main-

taining the policy of seclusion. The Shogun was in a very difficult position. Very soon the foreigners found that in cases of rough handling, the Shogun was incapable of redressing their grievances. In 1866 at the instance of the British minister, Sir Harry Parkes, the Mikado was persuaded to ratify the treaties made by the Shogun.

The End of the Shogunate:

The anti-foreign movement now turned into a political movement for the deposition of Shogun. When in February 1867, the tolerant and enlightened Mutsuhito became the Mikado, an era of reorientation began. He took the title of Meiji (enlightened rule). At the request of the party opposed to Tokugawa, the actual power was now restored to the Mikado by the then Shogun.

The end of the Shogunate was however at first a transference of power from the Tokugawas to their rivals, the Satsumas and Choshus. But the tide of political progress could not be checked indefinitely. In 1869, the great feudal lords in order to strengthen the government resigned their powers to the hands of the Emperor. In 1871, an imperial rescript was issued, formally abolishing feudalism. A steel-frame planned on the lines of French system was introduced.

Very soon a movement started for the establishment of a representative assembly. The leaders of the

movement took their stand on the Mikado's promise of 1868, namely, "all measures shall be decided by public argument." In 1881 a parliament was promised. Western constitutional systems were studied and in 1889 a constitution was granted. It established a bicameral legislature. Very large powers were, however, retained by the monarch. Parliament met for the first time in 1890. The constitution succeeded in satisfying the political aspirations of the people.

Transformation of Japan:

More significant than the constitutional changes were the far-reaching social and economic changes that followed the restoration. Japan quickly grasped the fact that the materialistic civilization of the West was certainly superior to its own, and did not hesitate to graft the best elements of Western culture on the "Land of the Rising Sun". Study of Western ideas, institutions and methods was encouraged and foreign travel was no longer tabooed. In 1872 the principle of compulsory elementary education was adopted and a system of public schools was started. Primary and secondary education was modelled on that of U. S. A.; a university at Tokyo was founded on the model of France, and the German system was copied in the sphere of vocational education. Female education was encouraged, and girls along

with boys were required under compulsion to attend schools. It is really striking that within a few years of her contact with Western nations, Japan realised that a sound system of education lay at the roots of national regeneration, while many of the backward European nations introduced compulsory primary education long after Japan, while after more than a hundred years of British rule India has still to wait for a system of compulsory primary education.

Intolerance was gradually abandoned, Christianity began to spread steadily. Closer contact with Western people gradually led to the abandonment of many superstitions. The practice of vaccination was no longer unpopular. In 1873, the European calendar was introduced. Spread of education produced civic consciousness and honesty in public life. In spite of the hostile attitude of government, journalism developed quickly and in the early eighties, one hundred journals were circulating.

The Japanese army was shorn of its feudal traditions. It was equipped with modern weapons and trained under French and German direction. Universal military service was introduced. The navy was also developed on Western model and under British direction.

Communications were developed. The old courier was replaced by a postal system and telegraph was also introduced. In 1872, the first rail-road was opened.

The currency system was reformed and banking was encouraged. In 1882, a Central Bank called the Bank of Japan was founded and within five years the Yokohama Specie Bank, a foreign exchange bank, was established.

With this enviable story of progress to their account we must not sneer at the Japanese for copying the Western nations in matters of dress, and social manners. In their case at least, these do not speak slave mentality.

After undergoing this transformation Japan advanced to measure her strength against other powers, Eastern or Western.

References: •

Douglas: Europe and the Far East

Vinacke: A History of the Far East in Modern Times.

THE SCRAMBLE IN THE FAR EAST

“The Far Eastern Question is the outcome of the expansion of two vigorous races, that of Japan and Russia, at the expense of the almost torpid polity of China.” (Holland Rose)

Dispute over Korea:

The economic development of Japan created a desire for commercial expansion; this was merely a repetition of what had happened to Western nations after the industrial revolution. Recognising the weakness of China Japan naturally cast her longing looks on the peninsula of Korea. The connection of Japan with Korea had always been intimate. She had imbibed through Korea, arts, letters and religion from China. Korea was a kingdom over which the Chinese government had suzerainty. Japan, alarmed at the southward advance of Russia, confidently challenged China's suzerainty.

The Chino-Japanese War (1894-95) :

The dispute led to a war in 1894. The war lasted for nearly nine months, and the ‘race of dwarfs’ (as the Japanese were called by the Chinese) proved their superiority both on land and sea. It was something like a war between a modern Western nation and a decre-

pit Asiatic state. The Japanese drove the Chinese out of Korea, invaded Manchuria where they seized the fortress of Port Arthur, and made preparations for a march to Peking. China was compelled to sue for peace. The terms were settled in April, 1895, by the treaty of Shimonoseki. China recognized the complete independence of Korea, ceded Port Arthur, Liaotung Peninsula, the island of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands to Japan, and agreed to pay a huge war indemnity.

Japanese victories confirmed the superiority of Western arms and methods even when employed by an Asiatic nation. It also proved conclusively the weakness of China. Hitherto, Western nations had forced concessions from China; now an Asiatic nation exposed the helplessness of the Chinese and disturbed the integrity of the Heavenly Empire.

Intervention of Russia:

But Japan was prevented by Russia from reaping the well-earned harvest. Russia posed as the friend of China. Russia advised Japan not to occupy the Liaotung Peninsula, and induced France and Germany to join her protest. Recognising that it would be folly to resist three Western nations, Japan yielded, and restored the Liaotung Peninsula along with Port Arthur. The incident taught Japan the necessity of friendship with some Western power against any such contingency in future.

Within a few years the insincerity of the powers who now championed the integrity of China against Japan was exposed.

German Aggression:

When in 1897, two German missionaries were murdered in Shantung, a German squadron quickly appeared to demand redress and seized Kiao-Chow. By a treaty, Germany secured a ninety-nine year lease of Kiaochow, and considerable commercial and financial privileges in the province of Shantung.

Russian Adventures:

In 1895, China, in order to pay the indemnity to Japan, had to resort to foreign loans. Russia eagerly extended a lending hand. This gave her some control over China's public finance. Next year, Russia secured the concession of extending the trans-Siberian Railway to Vladivostok via Manchuria. She also secured mining privileges and certain military and naval concessions. In 1897, she acquired a lease of Port Arthur for twenty-five years.

French Gains:

France also contributed generously to the foreign loan scheme in 1895. In exchange she obtained valuable mining privileges in Central and Southern China and the right to extend the Annam railway into China as well as the opening of new ports.

British Activities:

In face of these significant incidents Britain could not rest assured. She secured revision of her Burmese boundaries. In 1898, she secured the lease of Wei Hai Wei for as long a period as Port Arthur would remain in Russian occupation.

The Policy of the Open-Door:

It appeared that China would very soon be partitioned among the great European nations. But this was prevented by the attitude of United States. The foreign policy of U. S. A. was generally opposed to any imperialist adventures in the Old World. As long as the peaceful pursuit of trade was not interfered with, U. S. A. would not resort to force. In international trade, U. S. A. consistently championed the principle of equal chances for all nations. In 1844, at her instance, China had adopted the open door principle (see section on the Opening of China).

In 1898, as a result of her war with Spain, U. S. A. secured the colony of the Philippine Islands. It was apprehended that U. S. A. would also follow the lead of the other Western powers in China. But in 1899, the Washington government again reiterated their faith in the policy of equal opportunity for all nations and asked the powers concerned to formally approve this principle. All powers except Russia responded unequivocally.

Boxer Movement:

The encroachments made by the European powers combined with missionary activities gradually created a fierce antiforeign movement in China. It was encouraged by the Imperial government at Peking with a view to diverting the attention of the people from the agitation for political reforms. "Get rid of the foreigners and all difficulties have been overcome" was the slogan of the Manchu government. The movement was most fierce in Shantung. There were many secret societies of which the most important was the "Society of Harmonious Fists," or Boxers. They committed outrages on foreigners. In 1900, these outrages became so numerous in Shantung and Chihli that the legations could no longer remain unconcerned. But very soon, the legations themselves were besieged with the connivance of the government. It was apprehended that all the foreigners there would be massacred. An international relief expedition consisting of troops from Japan, Russia, Germany, France, Britain and U. S. A. under the command of a German general was despatched. The legations were rescued and the Boxer movement was easily suppressed. China had to pay huge indemnity, agree to the permanent quartering of foreign troops as legation guards, to prohibit the importation of arms for some years, abolish the Tsungli-Yamen and appoint a minister of

foreign affairs, to dismantle a number of forces and to punish the officials implicated.

At the close of the war, the foreign powers guaranteed the integrity of China, at the instance of U.S.A. Within a few years this proved to be a pious profession honoured in the breach. Japan could not forgive Russia for her conduct in 1895 and onwards.

Japan's Coming of age:

Within a few years of the inauguration of the Meiji, Japan felt it humiliating to continue the extra-territorial jurisdictions enjoyed by the foreigners. In July, 1894, Viscount Aoki, Japanese representative secured from Britain the abandonment of her rights of extra-territoriality and similar privileges. The example of Britain was followed first by U. S. A. and then by the other powers concerned. The new treaties came into force in 1892. "Thanks to the traditions, inherited and to the virtues of our ancestors, it has been granted to us to obtain full recognition of our sovereign rights"—was a significant passage in the imperial proclamation on the occasion.

"Transformed within and without, retaining her ancient fervid patriotism but armed with all the panoply of modern science, Japan took per place as a great power in the comity of nations." (Douglas)

Anglo-Japanese Treaty (1902):

In order to strengthen her position against Russia,

Japan at the beginning of the twentieth century sought for an ally among the Western powers. The result was an alliance between Japan and Britain in 1902. By the terms of the treaty, Japan recognised British interests in China, while Britain recognised special interests of Japan in Korea. If in the defence of its interests, either of the parties was engaged in war with a third power, the other would remain strictly neutral. In case, any other power should join the enemy of either of the contracting parties, the other agreed to come immediately to the assistance of its ally. The alliance was to run for five years.

It was the first treaty of alliance in modern times between a Western power and an Oriental state in which the two parties were on a footing of equality. To the Japanese it gave a standing such as had never before been attained by any Oriental state. Britain had upto now been following a policy of isolation, a policy which refused to get Britain embroiled in any international complications. But during the fateful years of the Boer rebellion in South Africa, Britain realised that her splendid isolation was in fact a dangerous isolation. Thus in 1902, Britain did not feel it beneath her dignity to accept "the friendship of a barbarian Mongolian nation".

Assured of British help in case of a war with Russia, backed by any other power, Japan now could measure her strength against Russia.

Russian activities in Manchuria :

Manchuria has been rightly called the granary of the Far East. In addition to its agricultural products, Manchuria is rich in timber and minerals. Thus for Japan, whose industrial development had received a fillip at the beginning of this century, the economic importance of Manchuria was immense. In 1895, she reluctantly released her hold on the Liaotung Peninsula, realising that it would be folly to face the combination of Russia, France and Germany. But when she found that Russia herself did not find any scruple in aggrandizing in north-eastern China, she could not afford to lose time any longer. Russian aggressions in Manchuria soon took the character of military occupation. The Chinese Eastern Railway (the name by which the Manchurian section of the Trans-Siberian railway was known) appeared to Japan to be as much a strategic railway as a commercial project. Thousands of Russian troops were garrisoned in Manchuria. Port Arthur was strengthened and a large fleet stationed there. It was evident that Russia had secured the Liaotung Peninsula to have a warm-water port and naval base. Japan naturally dreaded that Russia would next pounce upon Korea. Korea in the hands of a hostile power was "a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan." Japan demanded evacuation of Manchuria by Russia. Negotiations between the two powers dragged on from August, 1903 to February,

1904. Disgusted at Russian equivocation, Japan broke off diplomatic relations in the first week of February, 1904, and the war commenced.

Russo-Japanese War:

Japan was fully prepared for this war. The huge indemnity which she had obtained from China in 1895 had been used for the development of her army and navy. "Her spies and secret agents had thoroughly familiarised themselves with the topography and resources of Korea and Manchuria; and her diplomatists had secured a clear ring for the fight by the Treaty of Alliance with Great Britain. Her soldiers had the opportunity of comparing themselves with the Russians in the Boxer campaign. The result had not discouraged them. Her credit in the great money markets were good; and her supply of ammunitions and stores was complete down to the last gaiter-button. She threw down the gauntlet to one of the greatest Powers of Europe to the astonishment of the world but with the most complete confidence in herself, a confidence that was shared by every unit in the Empire, from the Heaven-descended Emperor on the throne down to the humblest private in the ranks." (Longford)

The incidents of the war have been narrated briefly in the section relating to Russia. The war was fought both on land and sea. It was however the Japanese navy which from the first took a leading

part in deciding the fate of the war. It was responsible for transporting supplies and landing troops in Manchuria. In August, 1904, the sections of the Pacific fleet of Russia posted at Port Arthur and Vladivostok were defeated disastrously and eliminated from the war. But the greatest naval battle was fought in the straits of Tsushima. Here the Japanese Admiral Togo annihilated a fresh fleet sent by Russia via Cape of Good Hope (May 27, 1905). Togo rightly earned the nickname of Japanese Nelson.

Peace was ultimately brought about through the good offices of the President of U. S. A., Theodore Roosevelt. By the terms of the treaty of Portsmouth, (September 5, 1905), Russia recognized Korea to be Japan's sphere of interest and transferred to Japan her lease of Liaotung Peninsula and also ceded the southern half of the island of Saghalin. Russia and Japan both agreed to withdraw from Manchuria.

The Results of the Russo-Japanese War :

- The outcome of the Russo-Japanese war affected seriously the history not only of Russia or Japan, but also of China, of India, of the East in general, as also of the West.

It shattered the Russian dreams of naval programme on the basis of a warm-water port. It redirected Russian foreign policy again to the Near

East. By exposing the weakness of the autocratic system of government, it encouraged fresh revolutionary activities within Russia.

Japan wrecked her vengeance on Russia to the full. She secured not only Liaotung which Russia had prevented her from annexing in 1895, but also southern Saghalin. In 1910, Korea was annexed. It was evident that Japan had inherited the legacy of imperialism.

The moral effects of the war were however more significant than the material results. For the first time in modern history, an Asiatic power had successfully faced a European power. The lesson was writ large that organisation and training were capable of rendering the Asiatic the equal, man for man, in military skill, bravery and endurance, of the European—even when backed by a long record of military triumph. To the West, the outcome of the war spelt ruin for the charm that any Western nation was superior to any Eastern. The battle of Tsushima was more disastrous for the prestige of the West than the First Afghan War or the Kut episode in the last World War.

To the East, it held out fresh hopes and a feeling of confidence. It also pointed out that Japan was victorious because she had rigorously set aside her own system of civilization and sacrificed all her conservative prejudices in favour of the civilisation of the West. Thus to China, the war served to be

an awakening from the slumber of centuries. China found that two great powers were fighting in a province of her own to decide how they should behave towards China, and contrary to her expectations, Japan was victorious against a formidable Western power. Why could not China do the same? There could be only one answer: She could do it if, like Japan, she broke with all the effete traditions of the past. Thus the reform movement in China gained impetus.

The outcome of the war had its repercussions on the political agitation in India.

References:

Douglas: Europe and the Far East.

Vinacke: A History of the Far East in Modern Times.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF REPUBLIC IN CHINA

The Reform Movement:

Her defeat at the hands of the 'race of dwarfs' in 1895 brought home to China the necessity of adopting the methods and institutions of the West. Interest in the study of Western sciences as well as philosophy grew rapidly. Henceforth American Universities began to attract a larger number of Chinese students. The imperial government was also compelled to change with the change of times. The system of recruitment through examination was abolished because the syllabus was dominated by the classical tradition and offered no scope to candidates educated in Western institutions. Reforms were also undertaken in the army. To aid the attainment of unity inter-marriage between the Manchus and the Chinese was encouraged. A movement for the abolition of the cruel and insensate custom of the foot-binding of women was soon launched and it received the support of government. In 1906, government passed a decree to the effect that within a period of ten years, cultivation, traffic and smoking of opium should come to an end. The soul of the reform movement so far as government was concerned was not the nominal ruler but his aunt, the Dowager-Empress Tzu Hsi.

The Dowager-Empress:

This lady who was the *de facto* ruler from 1860 to 1908 was a remarkable woman and need not fear comparison with Catherine II of Russia. It is not definitely known as to how far she was prepared to move in the matter of political reforms. She was no doubt naturally concerned in rejuvenating the Manchu monarchy, so that it might stand the onslaughts of Western political theories. The outcome of the Russo-Japanese War strengthened the reform movement to such an extent that in 1906 a constitution had to be promised and in August 1908 government announced a definite programme of gradual progress leading up to the calling of a national government within nine years. But the death of Tzu Hsi in November, 1908, placed the Manchu dynasty in a critical situation. There was no other member of the family who could take her place. As the Emperor was a minor, factions developed within the court. Within three years a revolution brought about the fall of the monarchy.

The following tribute has been paid to Tzu Hsi by a friendly critic: "Both her career and her character testify her being placed on a pedestal of her own as one of the greatest women who have appeared in the history of the world. No other evidence of her claim to that position need be adduced than the fact that in a country that has always been manacled by tradition, her dauntless courage, iron will, statesmanship,

diplomatic instincts, personal magnetism and profound scholarship, enabled her, in contravention of all tradition, to be the supreme political and administrative factor among four hundred million people for more than forty years,..... She was said to have been dissolute in her youth; but slander beats fiercely on a throne..... She was bigoted in her ultra-conservatism; but the last chapter of her life showed that she could sacrifice her most cherished conservative principles and, when the nation demanded reform with no uncertain voice, place herself at the head of the new movement..... One blot only remains on her record as a wise and far seeing sovereign. Only once did her genius fail her and that was when she gave her sympathy to the ill-starred Boxer movement. But she redeemed her error when the failure of the movement taught her that China would never hope so long as she retained her unprogressive conservatism, to overcome the united strength of all the Western powers of the world." (Longford in the last chapter of "Europe and the Far East," 1913.)

Causes of the Revolution:

The Revolution was the work of a large number of students educated in missionary schools or Western universities. The political theories of Montesquieu, Rousseau, Burke, Bentham and Mill, combined with the story of the experiments of republicanism in France or America could not fail to create a demand

for democratic government among the students. They fully exploited the discontent which was then stirring the country. The most active among these student-agitators was Dr. Sun Yat-Sen who had been educated in part in U.S.A.

The discontent was due to the oppressive taxation system. The oppressive taxes as also the mismanagement of public finance were caused by inefficiency of and corruption among the officials concerned. Official corruption was particularly marked in the matter of railway development.

But the root cause of the discontent was the pressure of population upon the soil. At the beginning of the 19th century, China counted about three hundred fifty million souls. In 1885, the figure rose to more than three hundred seventy seven millions. In 1911, it increased to four hundred thirty millions. The pressure on food-supply was not relieved to any appreciable extent by emigration to the Pacific coast of the U. S. A., Canada, or Malay. Floods and famines added to the miseries of the people without effectively checking the growth of population.

• A nation harassed by nature and oppressed by government is the most congenial soil for revolutionary propaganda.

The Revolution:

In order to prove its bonafide, the imperial government in October, 1910 convoked a National Assem-

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE

One of the most remarkable phenomena of the nineteenth century was the extension of European control over all portions of the earth. The last century was as much a century of colonial imperialism and commercial exploitation as a century of nationalism and democracy. It witnessed the craze among European nations for empire-building on a colossal scale. Europeans colonised whatever regions of the earth remained still unappropriated and started commercial relations with the coloured people throughout the world. Trade in its wake secured political control over these territories.

In 1815 Britain held, in North America, New Foundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and the territory between St. Lawrence river and Hudson Bay, Vancouver Island on the Pacific and the coast to its east; in South America, British Guiana and Trinidad; a number of West Indies islands as also Bermudas in the American portion of the Atlantic Ocean; in Africa, Cape Colony, Ascension and St. Helena; Mauritius and the few islands near Madagascar; Tasmania and New South Wales in Australia; in Indian Ocean the island of Ceylon; and in India, Bengal, Behar, Orissa, Northern Circars, Carnatic coast, the coast of Bombay and effective control over the Nizam and the Maratha confederacy. A hundred

years after, Britain had become the mistress of an empire over which the sun never set. The few provinces around the St. Lawrence river had now expanded into the Dominion of Canada. In Africa she held a mass of territories extending from Cape of Good Hope to Lake Tanganyika, namely Union of South Africa and Rhodesia; the territories between Lake Victoria and Sudan namely British East Africa; Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Gambia in West Africa; effective control over the Turkish province of Egypt; joint control (in partnership with Egypt) over Sudan; British Somaliland on the opposite coast of Aden; besides a large number of islands in the Indian and Atlantic Oceans. In Asia she held the Indian Empire including Burma; Ceylon, Malay and Sarawak in the Indian Ocean; Hong Kong and Wei Hai Wei in China. The strategic port of Aden along with the coastal strip was now a part of the Empire. The whole of the continent of Australia along with the islands of New Zealand were now held by English colonists. New Guinea and a large number of islands in the Southern Pacific had now become British possessions.

In 1815 France held nothing beyond a few islands in the West Indies. The Dutch having lost Ceylon and Cape Colony were content with their possessions in Sumatra, Java, Celebes and

Borneo. The Spanish and Portuguese colonies in South and Central America were on the eve of revolt and within ten years most of them broke away from the Home Governments and formed into republican states; Brazil became independent in 1889; Central American possessions of Spain became independent in the sixties of the nineteenth century. Germany and Italy, still suffering from the evils of disunion, had not yet thought of any colonial adventures. A century afterwards, France had become the mistress of an African Empire consisting of Algeria, Sahara, Senegambia, Upper Valley of River Niger, western valley of River Congo and Madagascar. She also held Indo-China in Asia. But the most disturbing element in 1914 was Germany. Germany had also carved out portions in East Africa, Cameroons and Niger Coast in Africa. In Asia she held Kiaochow and was intriguing with the Sultan of Turkey for economic exploitation in the Middle East. In the Pacific, she held a number of islands around the Equator, most important of these being the Caroline islands. Italy held Tripoli, Eritrea and Somaliland in Africa, and in March 1896 had met with a terrible defeat at Adowa at the hands of the Abyssinians for her encroachments into Abyssinia. Even the United States of America, the stout champion of a policy of non-intervention, was infected. In 1898 she annexed the Philippine islands from Spain. Her championship of the

independence and integrity of the Central and the South American Republics, asserted in the famous message of President Monroe in 1823, had within a century secured for her a sort of hegemony over the New World.

[We intend to lay more emphasis on the *causes* of these adventures than on their *details*.]

Origins of Empires:

In ancient times quest of glory and proselytising zeal were the usual motives underlying imperialist activities. In modern times, however, 'cash' has been the more important factor than 'glory'. Considerations of strategy have also inspired imperialistic activities. But it should be noted that some modern empires have been almost accidental in their formation. A case to the point is the British Empire. Seeley remarked that the English had almost blindly gone forward until at last they woke to find that they had made themselves master of half the habitable globe 'in a fit of absence of mind.' This was to some extent true of British activities up to the middle of the nineteenth century. But since that time, the fear of Russian advance in the East and afterwards that of German advance combined with the cry of British merchants for expansion of markets have inspired British colonial adventures. Accident alone cannot be held responsible for the

growth of empires. Delisle Burns rightly remarks: "Clearly deliberate policy has accompanied accident in nearly every case; but the proportion of it varies". In case of India it is very difficult to accept Seeley's statement in toto. The British 'pro-consuls' in India no doubt recognised the weakness of the Great Moguls and early realised that there was vacancy for some paramount power. But the authorities at London had no clear vision as regards the state of affairs in India and had no 'design' in their pockets. After the Mutiny of 1857 when the Company's rule came to an end, the home authorities began to study the affairs in India and very soon formulated a set of principles for the government and maintenance of the Indian Empire which had already come into existence.

The race for colonial adventures in the nineteenth century was accentuated by the Industrial Revolution. England was the first country to pass through this socio-economic phenomenon. As a result of this revolution she passed from an agricultural to an industrial country. Her population also multiplied, much to the consternation of Malthus. Thus unappropriated or sparsely populated territories were absolutely necessary for the surplus population. English emigrants flocked to St. Lawrence basin, Cape Colony and the convict settlements in New South Wales. The Industrial Revolution also created a need for raw materials. Raw

materials could be easily secured from tropical countries in Asia and Africa. So started the exploitation of tropical countries. These countries were also convenient markets for the finished products of Manchester and Birmingham. When France in the thirties and forties of the nineteenth century passed through Industrial Revolution, she also looked around for sources of raw materials and markets for finished goods. Napoleon III launched France on a career of colonial and commercial adventures. Germany after attaining her unity strove for her place in the sun. Bismarck was however hostile to colonial expansion. He fully realised that France would not easily forget Sedan and he liked to give France a free hand in the *Welt Politik*. He shrewdly anticipated that colonial adventures should prove to be the apple of discord between France and Britain and thus stand in the way of the formation of an *entente* between them. Clash of interests was inevitable, specially in the Eldorado of Africa.

Anglo-French Disputes:

• France and Britain long contested for control over Egypt. In 1875 Britain prevented France from securing sole control over the Suez Canal by purchasing the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal Company. In 1877 dual (Anglo-French) control over Egypt was established. A few years after there arose a semi-religious semi-political movement against foreigners

in Egypt. Britain suppressed the revolt and ultimately become the adviser of Khedive. France gradually withdrew from Egypt. But in 1899 there was a clash between the rival expeditionary forces of Britain and France at Fashoda in Sudan; it just stopped short of war. Regarding French rights over fisheries in Newfoundland there were constant hostilities between the two nations.

Anglo-German Tension:

The entrance of Germany into *Welt Politik* raised apprehensions in the minds of British statesmen as there was too little residue left for a great power like Germany. Two incidents confirmed these apprehensions. In 1896 when a British raid upon the Boer Republic of Transvaal was foiled by the latter, the young German Emperor telegraphed to the Boer leader, President Kruger, in the following terms: 'I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart on having, in conjunction with your own people, and without seeking the assistance of friendly Powers, and relying exclusively on your own forces against the armed bands who have raided your territory, succeeded in re-establishing peace and in maintaining the independence of your country against foreign invasion'. The Damascus speech of 1898 (referred to in a previous section) only intensified British feelings. The Berlin-Bagdad Railway scheme exasperated the British. (See Section on the Near East.)

Franco-German Hostilities:

Morocco was always considered by France as her sacred preserve. But Kaiser William II could not allow France a free hand there. In 1905 Kaiser made an attempt to secure protectorate over Morocco. A conference of Great Powers decided against him and in the favour of France. A few years after, Germany again disputed French activities in Morocco and sent a gun-boat to the Morocco coast. This lowered Kaiser in the eyes of the English public. War was however averted.

All these issues were decided in the Great War of 1914.

References:

- Muir: The Expansion of Europe,
- Rose: Development of European Nations.
- Burns: Political Ideals.
- Cromer: Imperialism, Ancient & Modern.
- Bryce: Studies in History and Jurisprudence.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF FREE NATIONS

“Slavery they can have anywhere. It is a weed that grows in every soil.....freedom they can have from none but you. This is the commodity of price of which you have the monopoly”.

(Burke on Conciliation with America)

The Disruption of the First British Empire:

When in the sixties of the 18th century, British authorities at home decided to levy taxes on the thirteen English colonies in America, the colonies naturally resisted on the traditional English constitutional principle that there could be no taxation without representation. The impertinent attitude of the Westminster authorities provoked the colonies to rebel against the mother country. Edmund Burke pleaded in vain for conciliation and the home government, ignoring his wholesome advice of extending English democracy over the colonies, took up the gauntlet. The war resulted in the victory of the colonies. The thirteen colonies formed into a republic with George Washington as the first President. Thus the first British Empire foundered on the rock of taxation.

The lesson of that disaster was too clear to be missed by thoughtful English politicians. Henceforth the Westminster authorities adopted a sympathetic and expedient policy towards English settlers abroad.

Canada :

A large portion of the population in Canada were French in descent and hence Catholic by religion. Mismanagement and high-handed behaviour of British officials created disaffection among the Catholic colonists. By 1837, disaffection was widespread among all sections of the people and a rebellion started. After suppressing the rebellion, English Government sent a mission under Lord Durham to study the grievances of the colonists. Durham propounded a radical solution. The provinces of Canada like the old American colonies possessed representative assemblies. Durham suggested that the executive council of the governor should be made responsible to the colonial assembly. The solution was accepted; it was put into effect in 1847 by Lord Elgin, the governor of Canada. Thus a precedent was created in the constitutional history of the British Empire. In 1867, another stage in the history of the Empire began. By an act of Parliament (30 & 31 Vict. c. 3) the colonies of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were federated into the Dominion of Canada. The executive government of the Dominion was vested in the Crown acting through a Governor-General; the powers of the central government and the provinces were clearly demarcated, and a Dominion parliament, consisting of a nominated senate and an elected house of commons, was set up. All the North American colonies except

Newfoundland entered into this federation. It was implied that the Governor-General should not interfere with the work of the Dominion ministers. Canada since 1867 has been enjoying full responsible government.

Australia:

Australia started as a convict settlement. On expiry of their sentences, the convicts received lands and settled down there. After 1840, the system of sending convicts was abolished due to the opposition of old settlers. The discovery of gold deposits very soon attracted a tremendous immigration. Gradually the whole continent was explored. Six colonies grew up: New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and Tasmania. These colonies like the American colonies were left to themselves and developed self-governing institutions on the Canadian model. Very soon, a Pan-Australian nationalism spread among the different colonies. The feeling was encouraged by economic considerations for a uniform system of commercial and industrial policy. Various experiments in federation were carefully studied and ultimately a constitution was drafted. It was ratified by the British parliament under the title of "Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act" (1900). The provinces were given greater powers than the Canadian provinces. The Commonwealth

was inaugurated on January 1, 1901 by the Prince of Wales (later on King George V).

New Zealand:

English connection with New Zealand began shortly after 1815, but formal annexation was declared in 1839. In 1854, responsible government was granted to New Zealand. A few years after, it was recognised as a separate colony as it did not enter into the Commonwealth. In 1907 the colony was designated as the Dominion of New Zealand.

The Union of South Africa:

During the Napoleonic Wars, England seized the Dutch possession of Cape Colony. Besides the Africans, and Malay slaves owned by the Dutch, there were nearly 30,000 people of European descent, mostly Dutch. Very soon friction started between these last (called Boers=peasants) and the English settlers. Disgusted at the conduct of English traders and officials a large number of Boers withdrew from Cape Colony and trekked or passed in a body into the North. They founded two republics: the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. Britain made an attempt to annex the Orange Free State, but had to recognize its independence in 1854. About twenty-five years after, Britain attempted to annex Transvaal, but met with similar fate. When in the eighties, gold deposits were discovered in the Boer Re-

publics a great influx of English immigrants began. Troubles quickly arose between the native Boers and the haughty Uitlanders (foreigners). This led to a war between the Boers and British government. The English won in the end (1902). The home government happily decided to grant responsible government to the Boer colonies (1906—7). In 1908, a convention was held in which the colonies, Cape Colony, Natal, Transvaal and Orange River, were represented; it drafted a constitution for the South African Union.

By the South Africa Act of 1909, the four colonies were united. Executive power was vested in the Crown administering through a Governor-General, assisted by a council of ministers; a bicameral legislature was set up. The South African Union is not a federal union of the orthodox type; the provinces enjoy restricted powers.

The loyalty exhibited by the Dominions during the Great War proved the soundness of the system inaugurated by Lord Durham and courageously applied by Campbell Bannerman even in case of the Boer colonies.

Ireland:

The great Liberal statesman, William Gladstone, had decided to make amends for all the injuries done to Ireland by Poynings, Wentworth, Cromwell and George III. He made two attempts to grant Home

Rule to Ireland. The first bill (1886) split the Liberal party; the second (1893) was shipwrecked in the House of Lords. A new Home Rule Bill was successfully carried through by the Asquith ministry in 1910. The Protestant settlers of Ulster threatened armed resistance. Britain was on the brink of a civil war, but the situation was averted by the outbreak of the War (1914). Another bill was passed suspending the operation of the Home Rule Act. The Irish nation was exasperated and the extremists (Sinn Feiners) gained leadership. After the War the Sinn Fein won a thumping victory in the general election, refused to meet in Westminster, met in Dublin and proclaimed an Irish Republic. The grant of responsible government to Ulster in 1920 prolonged the Irish rebellion. In December 1921, Britain had to grant full responsible government to Southern Ireland by treaty. Thus came to existence the Irish Free State. Very soon the moderates gained the lead and cordial relations between Britain and Irish Free State continued till the return of De Valera to power in 1932.

The Imperial Conference of 1926 and after:

The representatives of the Dominions met at a conference in 1926. The status of the Dominions was thus decided in the report of that conference: "They are autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to

another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations.' This applied to Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Irish Free State. By the Statute of Westminster (1932), Dominion Parliaments have been invested with full sovereign rights under the Crown. The Dominions have their own fighting forces and they themselves manage their defence problems. Britain is thus merely a chief among equals.

But this commonwealth ideal does not include the coloured portions of the Empire.

References :

Egerton : A Short History of British Colonial
Policy.

Keith : The Constitution, Administration, and
Laws of the Empire.

SLAVERY AND CIVIL WAR IN AMERICA

"I will be as harsh as truth, and as uncompromising as justice. On this subject I do not wish to think, or speak, or write with moderation. No! No! Tell a man whose house is on fire to give a moderate alarm; tell him to moderately rescue his wife from the hands of a ravisher; tell the mother to gradually extricate her babe from the fire into which it has fallen—but urge me not to use moderation in a cause like the present. I am in earnest—I will not equivocate—I will not excuse—I will not retreat a single inch—and I will be heard."

(William Lloyd Garrison in 1831)

Early History of Slavery in America:

Within a few decades of European immigration into North America, the practice of enslaving the negroes started. As the Red Indians could not work hard under the tropical sun the necessity arose of importing coloured labour from Africa. Thus started the heartless practice of kidnapping the negroes. The Spanish, the Portuguese and the English were the pioneers in this business of kidnapping innocent 'brutes' with a view to selling them in America. In 1713, by the treaty of Utrecht, Britain secured the monopoly of slave trade. Thus this 'traffic in blood' was as much

profitable to the planters of America as to the merchants of Britain. Through the efforts of William Wilberforce and other English humanitarians, in 1807 slave trade was prohibited, and in 1833 the institution of slavery was prohibited, in British Empire. But these did not affect the position of the negroes in the United States. In 1790, some years after the successful termination of the War of Independence, there were about 697,000 slaves in the United States; by 1861, the figure rose to 4 millions. The fact that the slaves were all coloured people explains the toleration of the institution upto the middle of the 19th century. Joshua's portrayal of a negro slave making the plaintive enquiry, "Am I not a brother and a man?" evidently failed to move the white Republicans. The growth of cotton cultivation in the Southern states in the first decades of the 19th century made slavery an economic asset, too precious to be voluntarily surrendered. In the Northern states, however, the institution gradually became extinct. The Northerners were industrialists and had no need of slave labour whereas the Southerners perching under the tropical sun were too eager to utilise slaves in their cotton plantations. Thus there was a sharp difference of economic interests between the North and the South. Moreover, the North was the stronghold of the Methodist Church. Hence, humanitarianism was a popular creed

with the Northerners who stood to lose nothing by the abolition. With the Southerners however there could be no other relation between the black and the white, except "that of the horse and its rider".

The Abolition Movement:

From about 1830, the movement for abolition grew in strength under the leadership of William Lloyd Garrison. Garrison was not a man to accept compromise. He denied the claims of white superiority, the plea of better conditions of the slaves as against the white working classes, or the prediction of extinction for the emancipated negroes in the race of the survival of the fittest. In 1852 came out *Uncle Tom's Cabin* which was successful in turning the movement against slavery into a popular crusade for the defence of morals. When in 1857, the Federal Court decided (the Dred Scott's case) that the slave was a chattel without right, and that the institution could not be prohibited from any particular territory of the Union under the then constitution, the Northerners were exasperated. In 1860, Northerners were successful in securing the election of their candidate to the presidency. Abraham Lincoln, the Republican candidate set up by the North, won the election, mainly because of the numerical superio-

city of Northern citizens and partly because of a split in the ranks of the Southern party, the Democrats.

The "right" to secede:

The Southern states held that the President or the Union Government had no legal control over slavery in every state. They pointed out that under a federal constitution the sovereignty resided in the constituent states, and not in the centre, and if the centre tried to interfere in the affairs of the states, the affected states might secede from the Union. The Unionists or the Republicans held that the Union was not a confederacy and hence the constituent states had no right to break away. They further held that the sovereignty resided in the centre, though under the constitution some of the sovereign powers had been delegated to the states. Thus according to them, the Union Government, as the supreme sovereign authority, had the right to chastise the recalcitrant states.

The Southerners felt that the industrialists of the North were bent on running down the agriculturists of the South. They decided to secede. Six weeks after the election of Abraham Lincoln, South Carolina hauled down the Union flag and flew its own. By January 1861, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas and Georgia broke away. The insurgent states formed a confederacy under the presidency of

Jefferson Davis. Lincoln decided to preserve the Union at all costs.

The Civil War:

The actual war broke out on South Carolina's bombarding a Federal arsenal, on April 12, 1861. The President issued an appeal for 75,000 volunteers. Four other Southern states now left the Union and joined the Confederacy. The war was from the beginning ill-matched. The Northerners were numerically superior. As against the great reserve of the man power of the North, the great mass of negroes was a source of danger rather than an advantage for the South. Thirdly, the industrial North had a practical monopoly of machinery. The North had also a large resource in timber. Thus manufacture of war materials including the building of a navy was a monopoly of the North. Then again, meat and grain could not be had in plenty in the cotton states of the South. Last, but not the least, the Northerners were fighting for a cause which invested them with the halo of Crusaders. During the first stages, however, the South gained some remarkable victories due to the superior military skill of the Southern generals. President Lincoln, on January 1 1863, issued a proclamation emancipating all the slaves in the rebel states. It should be pointed out that Lincoln was not as sworn an enemy of slavery as Garrison was. He held slavery to be a dying insti-

tution. He was a Unionist first, and an abolitionist second. In order to save the Union, he resorted to this manœuvre. Strategic considerations made him emancipate the slaves before the war was over. The measure had profound results. Even Southerners were now compelled to enlist the negroes as free citizens. But henceforth, the Southerners had two fronts, one at home, the other outside, and the war became a siege of Confederacy. The war ended in victory for the North on April 9, 1865. Five days after, Lincoln was shot dead in an opera house. But the assassination could not prevent the emancipation.

Results of the War:

The first and foremost result was that the American Republic became socially homogeneous. The Republic was no longer half-slave, half-free. The emancipated negroes were invested with all the rights and privileges of free citizens.

The war decided for all time the vexed question of sovereignty in a federal union. It decided that the union government was the supreme sovereign authority and that in the American union, the interpreter of the constitution was the Supreme Court and not any constituent state; further, that in a federal union, secession was not permissible.

The war however widened the gulf between the North and the South. The economic loss incurred by the Southern planters made them hostile to the

Northern industrialists. Hence for a long time, Southern politicians were free traders, only because free trade was injurious to the interests of the industrial North. The democratic party whose stronghold is the South has been characterised by their hostile attitude also to capitalistic system.

The war however failed to erase the colour bias from the minds of the White men, specially of the the South. The Black peril soon inspired the formation of a secret society, *Ku Klux Klan*. The mission of this secret organisation is to terrorise the negroes in all sorts of ways and frighten them from exercising their political rights. The negroes still suffer from innumerable indignities of which lynching is a prominent example.

The citizen negro of today can still repeat the plaintive enquiry : Am I not a brother and a man?

Reference :

(See Next Section)

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY: ITS NATURE

The Monroe Doctrine:

George Washington, the founder-President of the United States in his last message as the President remarked, "Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humour, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world" (1795). This has been accepted as the corner stone of American foreign policy by the successors of Washington. It was a policy of non-intervention in extra-American politics which Washington left as a legacy of wise statesmanship.

But the success of a policy of non-intervention implied non-intervention by others in America. Thus when in 1823 the despotic governments of Europe decided to send a joint expedition to crush rebel Spanish Colonies in South America, Monroe, the then President, decided to thwart this intervention. He proclaimed that "any interference on the part of the Great Powers of Europe for the purpose of oppression or controlling the destiny, of the Spanish American States which had declared their independence, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States

and would be considered as manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States." This threat was sufficient to stop the intervention proposed by the European powers. (See section on the Concert of Europe) The Monroe message was in fact a championship of Republicanism in the New World. But this policy of 'Hands off America' had in it the germs of a new type of imperialism. It was a hint of Pan-Americanism under the leadership of the United States.

The Expansion of the United States :

The area of the United States on the mainland is now a little less than 3,000,000 sq. miles. The area of the territory with which the republic started in 1783 was about 827,844 sq. miles. This expansion has been due to the territorial advance towards the Pacific. Except a few states, all the acquisitions were due to exploration and immigration. Louisiana was purchased from Napoleon in 1803; Florida from Spain in 1819; the states bordering Mexico were annexed as a result of a war with Mexico (1846-48). But this expansion from ocean to ocean was the result of a national process of a trek to the Pacific. Though it cost many wars and led to the annihilation of many Red Indian tribes, this expansion can not be placed in the category of European colonial adventures in the

19th century. The expansion of the U.S.A. was the result of a quest for national boundaries.

United States in the Far East:

That the United States was not a competitor in the race of imperialism of orthodox type is evident from her conduct in the Far East. She forced Japan to open her door and she taught China to accept a policy of equal privileges for all, but she never tried to make any territorial acquisition. After the termination of the last War at a conference held at Washington (1922) the United States again propounded the theory of open door in the Far East.

For commercial and naval purposes, the United States had to acquire a number of islands in the Southern Pacific. The most important was the Philippine group. The Philippines were secured as a result of a war between Spain and the United States in 1898. This was the result of Spanish intervention in Cuba. The Cuban incident was exploited by the United States on the ground of Monroe policy.

Monroe Doctrine and Imperialism:

Monroe's message in 1823 should have made it evident to all powers concerned that the United States was not going to tolerate any intervention in the New World. Ignoring the warning, Napoleon III had in 1863 set an expedition to crush a republican

rebellion in Mexico. After the Civil War was over, United States quickly applied Monroe doctrine, secured the withdrawal of the French troops and helped the formation of the Mexican republic. Mexico started her independent career under the wings of the United States.

When in 1895, Britain was engaged in dispute with Venezuela regarding the boundary of British Columbia, the United States intervened. The claims of hegemony put forth by the United States, almost precipitated a war. This was however averted by means of arbitration.

When in 1896, a rebellion broke out in the Spanish Colony of Cuba, the United States sympathised with the rebels. Within a few years, Cuba, like Mexico, become an independent republic under the aegis of the United States. Thus the United States was emerging by the end of the 19th century as a Republican-Imperialist power.

Theodore Roosevelt, frankly admitted in 1904 that "the adherence of the United States to the Monroe doctrine may force the United States however reluctant, in flagrant cases of...wrong doing or impotence to the exercise of an international police power".

The Great War and after:

On account of what President Wilson considered to be gross violations of international law by Germany

in the last War, U. S. A. abandoning the policy of non-intervention in extra-American affairs, entered into the War on side of the Allies (see section on the War). After the War was over, the American Senate considered it wise to withdraw from the field of European politics. Wilson was censured for imposing an unjust peace upon the Central Powers and committing U. S. A. to the upholding of that peace. The League of Nations seemed to be not merely curtailing the sovereign powers of the United States in the New World, but also serving as an instrument to perpetuate an unjust peace. Hence from 1921, U. S. A. has again chosen a policy of holding aloof from extra-American politics.

References :

- Pollard : Factors in American History.
- Channing : History of the United States.
- Reddaway : The Monroe Doctrine.
- Bryce : American Commonwealth.
- Wilson : The State.

DIPLOMACY: 1870-1914

An Age of Armed Peace:

Between the Franco-German War (1870-71) and the outbreak of the last War, the world was free from any great international conflict barring the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5. There were occasions when international conflicts seemed imminent in the Balkans but the dangers were fortunately tided over by means of diplomacy. British antagonism to Russian encroachments in the Balkans in 1877-8 was soothed by the deliberations at Berlin. The Balkan Wars of 1912-13, though focussing the rival ambitions of Austria on the one hand and Serbia and Russia on the other, did not develop into a war among great powers mainly due to the fact that the great powers felt themselves not yet prepared for such a conflict.

Nevertheless, the whole period was a period of "preparation." 'Preparedness for war is the greatest security for peace' was the motto of politicians of all the great powers. There was a regular race for armament making. The masses felt that some war was imminent though nobody knew who would be the adversaries. Naturally there would be frantic efforts on the part of every power to secure allies against visible or invisible enemies. The result was that at the end of this period, we find a number of alliances among the great powers of the world.

Bismarck's diplomacy after Sedan:

After the attainment of the long cherished national goal of unification, Bismarck declared that Germany was satiated. Bismarck's sole ambition after 1871 was to preserve and consolidate the gains made till then. He never cast a longing look on the Balkans which 'were not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian Grenadier.' Neither had he any desire to launch Germany on a career of colonial expansion. He wanted to give France a free hand in the *welt politik*, so that colonial disputes between France and Britain might never terminate. He realised that Germany's entrance into the race for colonial adventures would certainly alienate Britain. With a hostile neighbour always planning to recover Alsace and Lorraine, Bismarck could not afford to lose the sympathies of Britain. Hence, he sternly resisted the idea that Germany should participate in the *welt politik*. The cardinal principle in this diplomacy was to create or encourage differences among Germany's potential enemies. His antipathy to colonial adventures was thus an integral part of his diplomacy. On the continent also he applied his policy of "divide and rule" with great success.

In 1872, he effected a personal alliance of the three Emperors (Germany, Russia, and Austria-Hungary) called the *Dreikaiserbund*, nominally directed against the Red International. It was in fact a Bismarckian move to win over the friendship of the

Habsburg monarchy suffering from the ignominy of Sadowa, without rousing suspicions in the mind of the Czar of Russia. Russia was however wounded by Bismarck's conduct in 1878. In the Congress of Berlin, Bismarck was the presiding genius. Sternly refusing to allow Germany to participate in the spoils of the Balkans, he acted as an arbiter over the claims of Austria, Britain and Russia. While he handed over Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austria, he allowed to Russia a portion of Bessarabia only as far as Europe was concerned, and had no objection to Britain's occupying Cyprus. This award of the 'honest broker', as he claimed himself to be, cost Germany the loss of Russian friendship. The inevitable outcome was the collapse of the *Dreikaiserbund*.

In 1879, Bismarck effected a Dual Alliance between Germany and Austria. Under the terms of the treaties, either party was bound to help the other when attacked by Russia; if either party were attacked by another power, say France, the ally should remain neutral, but if the enemy were aided by Russia, then the ally should come to the aid of the aggrieved party.

In 1879, Bismarck was free to select either Russia or Austria as Germany's ally. He selected Austria because "German Empire in alliance with Austria would not lack the support of England" (Bismarck's letter to the King of Bavaria). He fully realised that Britain alienated by Russia's adventures in the Middle East would be hostile to a Russo-German

alliance. Three years after, Bismarck persuaded Italy to enter into this alliance. Italy alienated by French adventures into Tunis had no objection to an alliance of mutual protection. Bismarck effected this alliance to encourage colonial troubles between Italy and France, so that there could never be any *rapprochement* between France and Italy. Thus originated the Triple Alliance which dominated European politics in 1914. The text of the treaty of 1879 was not published till 1887, and that of 1882 remained secret until 1914.

At the same time, Bismarck tried to secure the friendship of Russia by means of two Reinsurance Treaties. Bismarck had no objection to Russian aggressions in the Near East. But the Russo-German alliance collapsed after Bismarck resigned power into the hands of the new Kaiser

The Policy of Kaiser William II:

The new Kaiser was the representative of Young Germany, Germany aspiring for colonial possessions. The tremendous industrial development undergone by Germany during the eighties and the nineties made the commercial exploitation of tropical countries inevitable.

Kaiser's government actively encouraged German merchants and adventurers in search of "a place in the sun". Kaiser showed equal interest in the affairs of the Far and the Near East. In 1898, Germany

secured from China a ninety-nine year lease of Kiaochow and secured the Shantung peninsula as its sphere of influence. Two years later, a German general led the international expedition against the Boxer rebels (See the relevant section on the Far East). Germany also secured large territories in East Africa, West Africa and Congo. Numerous islands in the Pacific were annexed. But what was of greater significance to Britain was Germany's entrance into the Balkans. It was not merely a commercial move. German generals undertook the training of Turkish regiments, and German agents thronged the Court of the Sultan. The Kaiser paid two visits to the Near East. In 1898, he declared himself the friend and protector of 300,000,000 Muhammadans dwelling dispersed throughout the East (See section on the Eastern Question). To Britain, it sounded like an alliance with the Pan-Islamic movement of the Khilafat. The Kaiser had committed another blunder two years ago when he congratulated the Boer leader, President Kruger, upon inflicting a crushing defeat on British raiders. (See section on the Expansion of Europe). All these incidents, combined with the German programme of developing the navy (see section on the German Empire), naturally raised grave apprehensions in the minds of British statesmen. The only great English statesman friendly towards Germany was Joseph Chamberlain (Colonial Secretary, 1895-1902). His efforts to bring about a

" *rapprochement* with Germany failed. The carrying out of the German naval programme in the first few years of the twentieth century caused Britain to form an alliance with France. In the meantime two very significant Alliances had come into existence: the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1893 and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902.

Franco-Russian Alliance:

There were serious difficulties in the way of any *rapprochement* between Republican France and Czarist Russia. But when Germany definitely pushed the latter aside in favour of Austria, Russia began to search for a friend. In the eighties, Russia was badly in need of loans. France hastened to help her with loans amounting to 350,000,000 francs. French statesmen were eager to have some friend to offset the preponderance enjoyed by Germany. In May, 1890, nine Nihilists were arrested by French authorities. This soothed the suspicions of Czar. Very soon negotiations were started for an alliance between Russia and France. The result was the *Dual Entente* of 1893. By the terms of this treaty, Russia was bound to help France if she were attacked by Germany, and France was bound to fight with Germany if Russia were attacked by Germany. In 1899 the treaty was made permanent. But the terms of the treaty were not fully revealed until 1918.

The Franco-Russian *Entente* did not result solely

from Germany's failure to continue the Reinsurance Treaty. It was due to a number of other factors also. Russia, as the champion of the Pan-Slavonic movement, was bound to come to blows with the Habsburg Empire. But Habsburg Empire had a very staunch ally in Germany. Hence, Russia could not venture to proceed singlehanded against the two Central Powers. For the realisation of Russian ambitions in the Balkans—under the mask of Pan-Slavism—Russia found it absolutely necessary to ally with France, the western neighbour of Germany. France, on the other hand, suffering from the ignominy of Sedan and nursing the idea of revenge, could not find a better friend than Russia.

Anglo-Japanese Alliance (1902):

British statesmen, in the last decades of the 19th century, preferred a policy of 'splendid isolation' and refused to commit Britain to any international complications. But Germany's conduct exposed the weaknesses of such a policy. The Kruger Telegram (1896), the Damascus Speech (1898), the Bagdad Railway scheme and Admiral Tirpitz's navy scheme made the British statesmen realise that the splendid isolation was in fact a dangerous isolation. On the other hand, the fear of Russian advance was still looming large in the eyes of the Anglo-Indian statesmen at Calcutta and Simla. The result was the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. Details relating to this

alliance have been discussed in a previous section (Far East). The Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5 almost involved Britain and France in the conflict. France was the ally of Russia, and Britain was the ally of Japan, and it was apprehended that Britain would help Japan, and France, Russia. Due to the wisdom of the authorities at London and Paris the war was localised. But the war served to emphasise the need of some understanding between Britain and France.

Anglo-French Entente (1904) :

In 1904, Britain and France entered into an understanding by which France withdrew her claims of fishing rights in Newfoundland and gave Britain a free hand in Egypt. Britain, on the other hand, gave France a free hand in Morocco and Siam.

Three persons were chiefly responsible for this *entente cordiale*: Delcasse, King Edward VII, and Lord Lansdowne. Delcasse (French Minister for Foreign Affairs, 1898-1905) was the leader of a school of politicians who believed that the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine was more important than colonial possessions. Delcasse converted the French authorities to the theory that it was worth purchasing British friendship by withdrawing the long standing claims over Newfoundland fisheries or over Egypt. King Edward VII was more than once offended by impertinent innuendoes thrown by his nephew Kaiser William II, and had soft corners for the French peo-

ple. When Lord Lansdowne (British Foreign Secretary 1900-1905) favoured a policy of *rapprochement* with France, King Edward warmly approved it. He took an active part in giving effect to the idea. Lord Lansdowne believed that the balance of power so rudely disturbed by Germany could be preserved by an alliance with France.

Triple Entente (1907):

In 1905, the Liberals came to power in Britain. Sir Edward Grey took the foreign portfolio in the Government. He continued the tradition of Lansdowne. In the course of a speech in October 1905 he indicated the three cardinal points of British policy as (i) friendship with the United States, (ii) alliance with Japan, and (iii) *entente* with France.

In 1907, Britain, France and Russia formed a *Triple Entente* as a defensive measure against the Triple Alliance. It was hastened by the growth of the German navy. Russia withdrew her claims over Afghanistan and Southern Persia, recognising these as British spheres of interest.

The full implications of this *entente* were not known even to the intelligentsia of the countries concerned. Some believe that Edward Grey committed Britain to a policy of offensive alliance against Germany, with a view to destroying the German Colonial

Empire. In 1914, two systems of Alliance dominated European politics.

The Concert of Europe :

In an earlier section, we have traced the story of an attempt to secure international peace through conferences of great powers. This system failed after working for about fifteen years (1815-33). The idea, however, did not perish. The great powers favoured the policy of joint action, known as the Concert, by which the great powers exercised control and supervision over the affairs of the smaller states and the 'sick man' (Turkey). It was based more upon mutual understanding rather than treaties. By means of joint action, the independence of Belgium was recognised in 1830, a few years after Belgium was permanently neutralised, some rules of maritime warfare were laid down (1856) and the Anglo-Russian tension of 1877-8 was tided over. The Concert was also successful in settling the colonial disputes, in securing immunity for red cross organisations and in laying certain humane rules of warfare.

There were, however, many obvious defects in the Concert. The Concert was pre-eminently a method to control the Turkish Empire. The principles of equality and sovereignty were again and again flouted, not only in the case of smaller states but also in case of Turkey. The Concert lacked a permanent

organisation and there was no definite programme of work. The system broke down in the crisis of 1914.

References :

Fay : Origins of World War.

Gooch : History of Modern Europe, 1878-1919.

Ex-Kaiser

William II : My Memoirs.

Ponsonby : Falsehood in Wartime.

Robertson : Bismarck.

Rose : Development of European Nations.

THE COMING OF THE WAR

The Serajevo Murder:

On 28th June, 1914, the Austrian Archduke and heir-presumptive, Franz Ferdinand, along with his wife Sophie Countess Chotek, was murdered in a street of Serajevo, the capital of the province of Bosnia. The assassins were Serbians, resident in Bosnia. The incident was extremely unfortunate and tragic as Franz Ferdinand, the accomplished Prince, was sympathetic towards the minor nationalities of the Habsburg Empire and favoured a scheme of transforming the Dual System of 1867 into a Triple System in which the Slavs of Bosnia and the neighbourhood would constitute an autonomous entity like Austria or Hungary. The scheme was not popular with Serbia as it meant the frustration of Serbian ambition of a Pan-Slavonic state in South Eastern Europe. The Austrian government naturally deduced that the conspiracy had been backed by the Serbian government. For about four weeks however Austria took no action. On 23rd July, 1914, she presented an ultimatum to Serbia. Austria called upon Serbia to suppress all anti-Austrian movements, to accept Austrian representatives with a view to crushing anti-Austrian movements, to dismiss such state-servants as Austria should accuse of anti-Austrian activities and to signify the unconditional acceptance of these demands within forty-eight hours.

Outbreak of the War:

Russia (the champion of Serbia), and France (the ally of Russia) urged the Habsburg government for the extension of the time limit. Britain joined this appeal. But Austria was adamant. Austria could count on the help of Germany in case of a war with Russia and hence refused to beat retreat. Serbia replied on July 25 offering to accept those demands which did not impair her sovereignty. Austria started mobilization and broke off diplomatic relations with Serbia. The Serbians counting upon the help of Russia started a counter-mobilization. On July 28, the Habsburg government declared war against Serbia. Russia at once started mobilization. Kaiser William II insisted that the war should be localised, but Russia refused and mobilised her troops on not only the Hungarian but also on the German front. Germany declared war against Russia on August 1, 1914. At the same time another despatch was sent to France demanding French neutrality. France returned an evasive reply and began mobilization. Germany declared war against France on August 3. But in the meantime German troops were set in motion towards Belgium. (Germany wanted to avoid the difficult southern route along Franco-German frontier.) Belgium refusing to grant passage to German troops on the ground that Belgium was a permanently neutralised country,

Germany declared war against Belgium. The news of the advance of German troops towards Belgium moved the English statesmen to action. Grey requested Kaiser to observe the inviolability of Belgium. The German Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg refused to comply on the ground of military necessity and rebuked Britain for threatening war just for a 'scrap of paper'. On August 4, at 11 p.m., Britain declared war against Germany. With extraordinary rapidity British troops occupied the Franco-Belgian frontier. On August 7, Montenegro declared war in favour of Serbia as a fellow Slav state. Japan, eager to devour the German colonies in the Far East, declared war against Germany on August 23. German agents in the mean time converted Turkey to the side of the Central Powers. On October 29, Turkish warships bombarded Russian portion of the Black Sea and immediately proclaimed war against Russia, the old enemy. Within a week, France and Britain declared war against Turkey. Britain declared the termination of Turkish authority over Egypt.

Italy waited for about a year and was ultimately won over by the Allied Powers. Bulgaria joined the Central Powers (October, 1915). In 1916, Portugal and Roumania joined the Allies. In 1917 the Allies were weakened by the withdrawal of Russia; after the Revolution Russia withdrew from the war. But the entrance of U.S.A. on the side of the Allies was great gain. In the wake of U.S.A. Cuba, Panama,

Greece (after the deposition of her king), Siam, Liberia, China and Brazil, declared war against Germany. The reasons for U.S.A's joining the War will be dealt with later on.

Causes underlying the War :

It is now evident that the Serajevo incident was merely a spark which set on fire the magazines of Europe. The very fact that the war could not be localised in the Balkans is a proof that even if the unfortunate Franz Ferdinand had not been killed, the war would have broken out sooner or later on some incident. Hence it is interesting as well as instructive to search for the underlying causes of the war.

“It all came from this damned system of alliances which was the curse of modern times”—was the verdict of Zimmermann. The new diplomatic institutions like Ententes and Alliances divided Europe into rival groups, each keen to uphold its own solidarity and prestige. The secret treaties and verbal understandings into which not even the Parliaments had any access made a great war inevitable in case a member of any group was in danger.

Such a system of secret alliances could not flourish without militarism. The result was that in 1914, every great power had a huge war machine. The big standing armies and navies with the attendant evils of espionage secured for the army chiefs a high place in the secretariats. In Germany and Russia

where the control of the people over the government was almost equally non-existent, the war lords thus dominated the diplomatic discussions. In 1914, the war lords of the rival powers hastened mobilisation, with a view to gain time. The competition to gain time forced the hands of the diplomats. In the matter of mobilisation, the war lords were supported by the great munition makers who could not resist the temptation of profiting at the cost of others' blood.

Nationalism became a tool in the hands of business magnates who were interested in securing colonial possessions. Every nation was thus fighting for 'a place in the sun'. "My country, right or wrong" was a very convenient formula for the capitalists of the rival powers. It worked wonders in increasing the gulf of hatred between France and Germany.

Nationalism was a constructive force in the 19th century. In the 20th it expressed itself as a destructive force. The non-German elements in the German Empire, the Poles in the Russian Empire, the Slavs and the Bohemians in the Habsburg Empire, were all aspiring to break away from the Imperial yokes. Thus if Russia and Serbia found it profitable to sympathise with the Slavs in the Habsburg Empire, Germany found it no less profitable to sympathise with the Poles of Russian Poland, and Britain cleverly exploited the oppressed nationalities within the Central Powers.

It may be pointed how Germany dealt the counter stroke by holding out hopes to the Muhammadans throughout the world.

Why England joined the War:

During the War, it was again and again asserted that England was fighting in defence of Belgian neutrality. No doubt by the treaty of 1839 to which both Britain and Prussia were parties, Belgium was permanently neutralised. But today no school boy of Britain believes that the plunge of 1914 was taken only to defend the "martyr state". From the middle ages right down to the present day it has been a corner stone of British foreign policy to see that no great power makes itself the master of the regions around the mouths of the Scheldt or the Rhine. This is the reason why Queen Elizabeth helped the Dutch Rebels in the 18th century, why William III fought with Louis XIV or why Pitt forced war on Revolutionary France. Netherlands in the control of any great power means menace to the safety of the British Isles. Thus, in 1914, it would have been folly to remain inactive. Even if Germany had not violated the neutrality of Belgium, Britain would have joined the War sooner or later, to oust Germany from the race of colonial expansion. The terms imposed upon Germany prove that Britain was not fighting for Belgium alone. In 1919, Britain and France along with Belgium hastened to partition the German Empire in Africa.

Magnanimity in politics is a rare virtue. In 1932, no power came to the rescue of China, and all the great powers watched the conquest of Manchuria by Japan. In 1936, the great powers acquiesced in the rape of Abyssinia as they had no interest worth meddling in the affair.

The Question of War-Guilt:

After the War was over, the triumphant Allies compelled Germany to accept all blame for bringing about the War. The publication of the state archives later on proved that the war-guilt belonged to all Europe, that Servia was not an innocent lamb sacrificed at the altar of imperialism, that Germany was not the black devil aspiring for hegemony over the whole of the world, that Britain was not fighting from altruistic motives alone. The real fact is that merchants, the diplomats and the war lords of all the great powers were eager for an Armageddon, whereas the workers and the youths who paid the price of the War were cajoled to support them. Ludwig concludes that the sum of guilt was in the Cabinets, the sum of innocence in the streets of Europe. "It is a lie that one single people as such wanted war."

From the hypothesis that Germany was responsible for this war, the journalists, the publicists, the pamphleteers and even some historians of the Allied Powers deduced the conclusion that Bismarck was at the root of all the trouble. Nothing can be farther from truth.

It has been pointed out again and again that Bismarck was hostile to colonial enterprises, and that he was not at all interested in the affairs of South-Eastern Europe. If the Bismarckian policy was adhered to, France and Britain would have never refrained from fighting over the colonial apple of discord. Therefore, any war between Germany and France over the issue of Alsace and Lorraine would have been a distant possibility. Even if such a war took place, that could never have assumed the proportions of a world war. Secondly, the critics of Bismarck point out that Bismarck, by providing Germany with an efficient war machine started the race of armament making. To some extent the charge is true. But let it be said to the credit of Bismarck that with him the army was merely an instrument of policy. He knew that the soldiers were good servants but bad masters. However friendly he might have been to Moltke and other war lords, in his heart of hearts, he placed upon them no higher premium than that he placed upon the heads of the civil service. During the rule of the Iron Chancellor, no war lord dominated the German Cabinet. Bismarck in his attitude towards the army may be compared with Cardwell and Curzon.*

* Cardwell, a member in the Liberal Ministry of 1868-74, effected the subordination of the Commander-in-Chief to the War Secretary in Britain.

Lord Curzon's efforts to secure the same in India met with failure. The story of Curzon's tussle with Kitchener is well known to Indian students.

Unfortunately after the dropping of the pilot, the war lords began to dominate the councils of the young Kaiser. In any case, to hold Bismarck responsible for the World War is as untenable as holding Richelieu responsible for the French Revolution.

Germany, however, must face a charge of diplomatic bankruptcy in 1914. The Kaiser again and again refused Grey's proposal for a conference. Acting on the information sent by the German embassy in London that Britain was on the brink of a civil war regarding Irish Home Rule, Germany believed that Britain would not be able to join the war immediately. But German calculations proved to be wrong. In the face of the national danger, Unionists and the Home Rulers of Britain sank their differences and presented a united front, as the Catholics and the Protestants had done on the occasion of the Spanish Armada, and the Whigs and the Tories against the Napoleonic danger.

References :

Ludwig: July 1914.

Fay: Origins of World War.

THE FIRST WORLD WAR

Character of the War :

In its methods and tactics, in its extent and intensity, the last war surpassed all the great wars of the past.

Formerly only professional army took part in war. In the last war whole nations were in arms. Millions of soldiers fought on every side; volunteers swelled the ranks; the universities were emptied; there were families which produced two, even three, successive generations of soldiers during the period of four years. Women took part in manufacturing the clothings and preparing rations for the troops; even invalids and old persons were provided with suitable works. Germany truly, though bluntly, pointed out that the old usage of distinguishing the civilian from the military population could no longer be adhered to.

Though the war started in Europe and was terminated in Europe, and though its principal field of activity was Europe, there was no part of the globe which was free from actual operations of the war or its strain. From Jutland to Chile, from the Rhine Valley to South Africa, from North Atlantic to South Pacific, everywhere the war levied its toll.

As the principal parties were almost equally matched, the war turned out to be a test of endurance. The natural outcome was the trench warfare. Mechanised warfare became prominent and human effort

was minimised. Machine guns were used in large numbers. Long range cannon came into frequent use. Chemistry was utilised for the purpose of uprooting humanity. Poisonous gases created havoc. Cavalry was substituted by tanks. Air bombardment gave an entirely new character to the war. The former wars were wars of two dimensions, the last was one of three dimensions, land, sea and air. Scientists and artists helped the work of camouflage operations.

No wonder that the last war proved to be terribly expensive to every belligerent nation. Heavy taxes were levied, patriotic aids were eagerly accepted and huge sums borrowed from within and without. Currency had to be inflated.

The Role of the Press:

In the last war, the press played no less an important part than the army or navy, the tanks or the submarines. In every country the press took up the mission of creating hatred against the enemy powers; incidents of atrocities inevitable in modern warfare were exaggerated and embellished with concocted stories. In this race of propaganda Britain attained perfection. British press under the leadership of Lord Northcliffe not only concocted facts as done by the German or Russian Press, but also published faked photographs of "war victims".

[It is well nigh impossible to compress the story of a war of such proportions into a few pages here.

Hence only a very brief summary of the events is attempted round the main theatres of the war.]

Fighting on the Western Front 1914-17:

Germany had long anticipated that France and Russia would try to sandwich her from two sides. Thus the German plan was to concentrate two-thirds of their forces on the Western Front, and, after knocking out France, to fall upon Russia. But the swift mobilization of Russia and the British help to the French disturbed the working out of this plan. Germany could not neglect her Eastern Front, neither could she beat retreat from Belgium—the selected route to France.

The Germans easily occupied the fortresses of Liege and Namur, pushed back the Anglo-French forces and pressed on towards Paris. French Government made arrangements for transfer of capital to Bordeaux. But a strategical blunder on the part of Germany saved the Third Republic from the situation of 1870. In order to meet the Russian invasion of East Prussia, the Germans withdrew two corps from the Western Front. The French now attacked. Combined British and French forces then hurled the Germans from the Marne to the Aisne. The Germans next advanced towards the sea with a view to outflanking the Allied troops. The Allied troops quickly followed them. Thus started that 'Race to the Sea' in which neither side succeeded

in outflanking the other. Both sides then dug themselves in for the winter. This began the famous trench warfare. In the meantime, the Germans had inflicted crushing defeats upon the Russians in the East. The next year (1915) also did not produce any change in the position on the Western Front. Fighting was no doubt incessant. Artillery duels, air fighting and night raids were taking place all along that long front. The French made two attempts to break through the German line, but were unsuccessful. Next year (1916) the Germans attempted a great offensive at Verdun. The French fought with wonderful courage and heroism and foiled this attack which began at the end of February and terminated by the end of June. On this occasion 400,000 Frenchmen died. The Allied troops next launched their offensive in the north around the Somme. In this campaign which lasted from July to November, tanks were used by the British with great success. Though the ground gained was not commensurate with the expenditure of men and munitions, the success of the Allies was a set-back to the Germans. Next year (1917) the Germans made a strategic retreat on the Somme and retired to a stronger line. Hindenburg took the initiative in this move. On account of his success on the Eastern Front, he was now given charge of the Western. In course of the retreat, the Germans devastated the territory, left by them, so as to make it useless

to the Allies. The Allies were however much strengthened by the help of U. S. A. It is time now to study the course of events in other centres of the war.

The Eastern Front 1914-17:

At the outbreak of the war, Germany found that Russia had mobilized far more rapidly than was expected. By the middle of August, Russia had gained some victories in Eastern Prussia. The Germans were forced to withdraw two corps from the Western Front. Now Hindenburg and Ludendorff wreaked vengeance on the Russians. In the marshy regions of the Masurian Lakes, the Russian forces were hammered to pieces (August 7, 1914). During the winter the Russians invaded the Austrian province of Galicia. The Germans now decided to knock out Russia first and hastened to the rescue of Austria. In the meantime, the Russians had again invaded East Prussia whereupon Hindenburg repeated his hammer blows (February 1915). The Germans and Austrians now combined and drove the Russians out of Galicia. The Germans next invaded Russian Poland and conquered it. Serbia was next conquered by Austro-German troops under Mackensen. The conquest of Serbia was facilitated by Bulgaria joining Central Powers. The same year saw the failure of a prolonged but heroic attempt made by the Allies to secure the Turkish peninsula of Gallipoli (see below). Next year (1916) the Germans conquered

Wallachia. Hence on the Eastern Front the Germans had sufficient reasons to congratulate themselves. Next year, a revolution took place in Russia. While the disasters of the Crimean War or the Russo-Japanese War merely served to shake the Czarist autocracy, the disasters of 1914-16 were sufficient to pull it down. Discontent was wide-spread and the loss of prestige could not save the Czardom from its inevitable fall. The Bolsheviks very soon gained power in Russia and before the end of the year they made an armistice with the Germans. Thus the Revolution was a great set back to the cause of the Allies.

The Near East 1914-1917:

Turkey by holding the Dardanelles prevented communication between Russia and the Allies through the Black Sea. Hence the Allies decided to force open the Dardanelles route, and, if possible, to knock out Turkey. In April, 1915, an expedition was sent to the peninsula of Gallipoli on the west of the Dardanelles. The expedition consisted of Britishers as well as thousands of Austro-New Zealanders. The 'Anzacs' (Australian New Zealand Army Corps) fought with extraordinary heroism, but it was fruitless against the Turkish generals among whom was Mustafa Kemal. The expedition had to be withdrawn after huge loss of life. It had one very important effect; the Turks engaged at home could not press any attack upon the Suez Canal. The Germans rightly

called the Suez Canal "the jugular vein of the British Empire" and directed Turkish attention towards it. Britain as a counter-stroke led expeditions into the Asiatic provinces of Turkey. In 1915 an expedition consisting of British and Indian troops was sent out to Mesopotamia. After some initial success, General Townshend, the commander of the expedition, pushed northwards upto a distance of two hundred miles. He was very soon out-manœuvred by the Turks and found himself besieged in the town of Kut-el-Amara. He resisted for five months, but had to surrender on April 29, 1916. The surrender was disastrous to the prestige of the Allied powers. Sir Stanley Maude was now appointed to the command in Mesopotamia, and Kut was recovered next year. Another expedition was simultaneously working in Palestine. Sir Edmund Allenby with Indian and British troops inflicted defeats on the Turks in Palestine and captured Jerusalem by the end of 1917. Britain had also to suppress anti-British movements in Western Egypt.

Maritime Warfare 1914-1917:

Just on the outbreak of the war, British navy blocked German navy's exit into the North Sea. A few cruisers eluded the British ships and were at large. There were also several cruisers in the distant seas on the outbreak of the war. The German men-of-war won a naval victory off the coast of Chile in

November, 1914. But this was soon avenged by the English who destroyed these ships off the Falkland Islands (December). In the November of the same year Japan forced the German squadron stationed at Kiaochow to relinquish its hold on the port. But a German cruiser, the *Emden*, gave much trouble to the Allies in the East. Throughout September and October, 1914, she haunted the coasts of India, harried British trade, set fire to an oil tank at Madras, torpedoed a Russian cruiser and a French destroyer near Malaya and captured several British merchantmen. She was ultimately spotted by an Australian warship, the *Sydney*, and battered to pieces. But no great naval action took place in the first two years of the war. German navy did not charge the British fleet in the North Seas nor the British fleet attempted to break through the German line. Germans made several raids near British coasts without any effect. Britain contented herself by securing an effective blockade. Germany as a counter-stroke proclaimed the waters around the British isles a war-zone and announced that enemy ships of all character found within that zone would be sunk without warning (February, 1915). Neutrals were also warned to keep out of this area. Then Germany started a submarine campaign. A large number of merchantmen, including the *Falaba*, the *Gulflight* and the *Lusitania*, were torpedoed. With the *Lusitania* perished twelve hundred men, women and children including a hundred

Americans. Woodrow Wilson, the President of U. S. A., remonstrated on this gross violation of international law. Germany offered to pay damages for the lives lost, but refused to admit the illegal character of submarine campaign. On March 24, 1916, an English ship, the *Sussex*, was torpedoed. Two Americans on board were injured. Wilson compelled Germany to agree that merchant vessels should not be sunk without warning. Wilson was also engaged in disputes with Britain over British interpretation of law, relating to contraband.

The year 1916 saw a great naval action, the only great naval action of this war. On May 31, the German High Seas Fleet under Scheer shot out of its exile. At about 2. 20 p.m., the English Admiral Beatty engaged in periodical scouting sighted enemy fleet, and engagement began at about 3-30. off the coast of Jutland. The main British squadron under Admiral Jellicoe joined late in the afternoon. Both sides fought with admirable skill. But the cloudy evening skies forbade Jellicoe carry the fight to a finish. Both sides retired by 9 p.m. Both sides lost a number of ships, both claimed to be victorious. After this incident neither the British fleet ever again attempted to break into the German line nor the German fleet could again emerge from its exile. [Beatty, relying on the superior skill of the British sailors and heavy guns of the British fleet, favoured a fight to the finish. Jellicoe took into consideration the

poor visibility which reduced the advantage of the heavy guns, as also the risk of torpedo to British ships, and he refrained. The experiment if risked might have sunk every German ship and conceivably ended the war in 1916. It might also have sent British dreadnoughts to the bottom and decided the battle of Jutland in Germany's favour with all its consequences.]

The next year (1917) Germany again resorted to unrestricted submarine warfare. On February 1, Germany declared that all ships met within the territorial waters around Britain, France and Italy and even in the Eastern Mediterranean, will be sunk. In order to meet Wilson's protests Germany agreed to permit one American passenger ship per week to England. U. S. A. cut off diplomatic relations on February 3. On April 6, U. S. A. declared war against Germany. Germany carried on submarine campaign ruthlessly. April was the Black Month for the Allies. Nearly 900,000 tons of shipping were sunk. Britain and U.S.A. then started launching destroyers and submarines against the Germans. By the end of 1917, the German submarine campaign had failed. ,

The year 1917:

The year 1917 was the turning point in the history of the war. While the Russian Revolution was a great set-back to the Allies, the entrance of the United States on the side of the Allies more than compensated the

loss incurred by the Russian Revolution. The United States with her soldiers, her enormous financial resources and mechanical devices was of immense help to the Allies. The very fact that the United States repudiating her traditional policy of isolation had joined the Allies was a great moral gain for the Allied cause. The British had retrieved in the Near East the disaster of Kut. Bagdad was captured by Maude in March, while in December Allenby captured Jerusalem. British agents under the guidance of T. E. Lawrence, a brilliant and crafty Oxonian, preached ideas of nationalism in Arabia, Palestine and Mesopotamia. The Arabs were taught to remember that the Turks were once the barbarians of Central Asia, a race without culture. The Germans, on the other hand, relieved of fighting on Eastern Front, could concentrate on the West. Hence in 1918; the interest of the war mainly revolves round the Western Front.

•

The End:

The Germans, after securing the elimination of Russia from the war made preparations on a grand scale for offensive on the Western Front. Between March and July, Ludendorff delivered four tremendous offensives using long range cannon. But these were of no avail. The Allies effected a sweeping reorganisation and placed Marshal Foch as the Supreme Commander of the Allied forces. Secondly, the

Americans were pouring in millions. After the failure of the German offensive the Allies delivered a counter-attack. The Hindenburg Lines were broken and by the end of October, the Germans had lost every inch of French territory. In the meantime, the Central Powers had met with disaster on other Fronts. The Italians who in 1915 joined the Allies in the hope of securing Trieste and Trent from Austria and who met with terrible reverses in 1917, had in June, 1918, repelled the Austrian troops. Bulgaria had surrendered in September. Conquest of Palestine and Mesopotamia had forced the Turks to sue for armistice (October 31). The news of these disasters broke the *morale* of the German army. There were serious disturbances in Berlin on account of anti-Kaiser movement launched by the Socialists. On account of the successful revolt of the oppressed nationalities, the Habsburg Government was very soon forced to sue for armistice (November 4). The Kaiser abdicated on November 9. Two days later, the armistice was signed between the Allies and the German Generals.

After the war was over, there began the more difficult war of rival claims put forth by the diplomats of the belligerent nations. A conference at Paris settled the terms of peace. Before we deal with the peace treaty, we must know something regarding the part played by the members of the British Empire in the War, as also the causes of Allied victory.

Services rendered by India and the Dominions:

India with her enormous resources in man power and gifts of nature helped Britain most ungrudgingly. Indian industries and agriculture met most of the necessities of the British Commissariat in the Middle and Near East. Thousands of Indians fought in Flanders, Egypt, Palestine, Mesopotamia, East Africa and China. More than a million officers and men served overseas, and Indian casualties amounted to 100,000. Lord Birkenhead, the great Conservative, remarked: "The winter campaign of 1914-15 would have witnessed the loss of the Channel ports, but for the stubborn valour of the Indian Corps.....Without India, the War would have been immensely prolonged, if indeed without her help it could have been brought to a victorious conclusion." Indian soldiers were responsible, in part, for the defence of Egypt and the conquest of German East Africa, and to a large extent for the conquest of Mesopotamia and Palestine; Indian troops cooperated with the Japanese in the conquest of Kiaochow.

Some of the Indian soldiers were awarded the highest honours open to the British Army. Among these should be mentioned Sepoy Khoda-dad-Khan (Flanders) and Sepoy Lala (Kut-el-Amara), both recipients of the Victoria Cross.

The part played by Indians in aerial warfare deserves a special note. Four Indians, Indra Lal Roy (son of a noted Bengali lawyer), E. S. Sen (another son of

Bengal), Hardit Singh Malik (a youth from the Punjab), and Velinkar (a Maratha youth) served in the Royal Flying Corps on the Western Front. Roy shot down nine enemy air-craft and perished in the Western Front. Velinkar also had been killed during the War.

The Dominions most faithfully co-operated with Britain. The heroic exploit of the Anzacs has been already noticed. The Australian navy along with the Japanese conquered the German colonies in the Pacific. Canadian soldiers fought with extra-ordinary bravery in the Flanders. But most significant of all was the help rendered by the South Africans. The Boer rebels of 1900 co-operated with the English colonists in conquering German possessions in East Africa and West Africa. General Smuts, the former rebel chief, rendered most useful services as a member of the War Cabinet.

Causes of the Overthrow of the Central Powers:

With the exception of Russia, the Allied Powers were more or less democratic and enjoyed whole-hearted national support. After the withdrawal of Russia and coming in of U.S.A., the Allies could boast that they were fighting against despotism and divine right. The Central Powers, on the other hand, though extremely strong on land suffered from all the defects of autocracy. The disasters abroad quickly kindled socialist movements in Vienna and

Berlin and a republican movement in Angora. The Central Powers were also much embarrassed by the activities of the insurgent nationalities.

From 1917 onwards, it was evident that the war was not at all equally matched. The resources of the Central Powers in men and money were insignificant in comparison with the resources of the British Empire and U. S. A. combined.

President Wilson's championing of the Allied cause invested it with a moral halo. The German submarine campaign was a naked truth, and no concoction like the Belgian atrocities. From 1917 onwards, Germany stood condemned in the opinion of the world.

Yet Germany 'resisted with wonderful grit.' She was ultimately starved to surrender. The British navy not only secured an effective blockade of Germany but also helped the British commerce to suck out all the available supplies from the world. Want of rations created widespread discontent in Germany. Allied Powers exploited it in inciting mutiny. The German fleet surrendered without resistance on November 18, 1918.

The Problems of Peace:

After the complete collapse of the Central Powers, it was evident that the peace, dictated by the Allies, would be a peace of vengeance. 'The fight to save democracy' was a slogan which had been used during

the war, more as a diplomatic camouflage than as an honest profession. France was more concerned to recover Alsace-Lorraine and if possible to carve out colonies from the shattered German colonial empire, than to secure democracy for all sections of humanity. Britain was concerned in the destruction of German sea power, German commercial supremacy and German colonial empire more than in securing self-government for the coloured peoples throughout the East: in fact, self-government for all peoples would be as dangerous to Britain as to Germany. Japan was more eager to establish her hegemony over the Far East than to introduce self-government into Korea. Italy was determined to obtain 'unredeemed' Italian territories from Austria-Hungary. The Serbs were dreaming of a United Serb-Kingdom on the shores of the Adriatic. The Poles in the three Empires (Romanov, Hohenzollern and Habsburg) were again dreaming of a consolidated Polish State. The oppressed nationalities, the Czechs and the Slovaks, had already risen against their common masters, the Central Powers.

The nationalist revolts within the Empires of the Central Powers presented the belligerents with some accomplished facts. In July 1917, the representatives of the Serbs of Serbia and Montenegro and their kinsmen from the Habsburg Empire had met in the Island of Corfu and declared for a United kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovans. The idea was

at once picked up by the Czechs in Austria and the Slovaks in Hungary. In April, 1918, a congress of oppressed nationalities was held at Rome. This congress declared in favour of the formation of a Czecho-Slovakian State. In October, 1918, Czecho-Slovakia and Yugo-Slavia came into existence. These national revolts were facilitated by the mutiny of the troops recruited from these nationalities. These troops at psychological moments refused to fight for the oppressive governments and joined the revolutionaries. In the meantime, British agents were successful in converting the chiefs of Arabia, Mesopotamia and Palestine. The Asiatic provinces of Turkey were soon emerging as national states.

Another problem was presented by the treaty entered into by the Bolsheviks with the Central Powers. By the treaty of Brest-Listovsk (March 1918), Russia had relinquished Finland, Poland, Lithuania, Esthonia and the Ukraine; and surrendered Russian Armenia to the Turks. Thus nationalism was working as a disruptive force in the outer provinces of Russia also.

The War was also the funeral of divine right and despotism. Russian Czardom fell in 1917. A revolution in Bulgaria caused the overthrow of the old king Ferdinand and introduced a sort of limited monarchy (October, 1918). About the same time a republican movement caused the over-

throw of the Habsburg dynasty and put an end to the Dual monarchy. Austria and Hungary became two separate republics. But the most significant successes of republicanism were in Berlin and Angora. Kaiser William II, the ablest ruler of modern times and the most attractive personality produced by a modern royal house, had to bow before the national will and abdicate on November 8, 1919. The infection also spread to Turkey, hitherto regarded as the citadel of medievalism and divine right. A republican movement engineered by the army chiefs under the leadership of Kemal Pasha started in Angora in 1919. Within four years the republicans won.

Hence, when the Peace Conference started, it had to face not only the claims of the great powers who fought against Germany, but also the demands put forth by the nascent states in Central and Eastern Europe. It had also to deal with Republican Germany and Republican Austria, the successors of the Hohenzollern and Habsburg Empires.

President Wilson, the idealist and the quondam professor of politics, was the presiding genius over this conference. On January 8, 1918, he had formulated his famous 'fourteen points' as the foundations of Peace Settlement. He demanded an end of secret diplomacy, freedom of navigation, removal of economic barriers, reduction of national armaments, adjustment of colonial claims, weight-

age for the interest of the natives in the colonies, restoration of Belgium, recovery of Alsace-Lorraine by France, readjustment of Italian frontiers, opportunity for self-development to the oppressed nationalities which he called the principle of self-determination, and last of all a concert of nations for guaranteeing the independence and integrity of all states.

The conference which started on January 18, 1919, and ended by 1920, was attended by a large number of diplomats, generals and 'experts' (professors and publicists). Four names should be mentioned—Wilson (U.S.A), Clemenceau (France), Lloyd George (Britain), and Orlando (Italy). Paris was the venue of the conference.

By a number of separate treaties, all the conflicting claims and interests were sought to be met. All these treaties are collectively known as the Paris Peace Settlement.

The Treaty of Versailles:

After the Allied statesmen had reached an agreement among themselves, Germany was admitted into the Paris Peace Conference in May, 1919. After much protest, the Germans had to accept the terms dictated by the triumphant Allies. On June 28, 1919, at the Palace of Versailles where about 50 years ago Bismarck had inaugurated the German Empire, the representatives of German Republic signed the treaty.

Germany accepted the the charge of war-guilt and consented to the trial of the ex-Kaiser and other 'war criminals.' She had also to accept the charge of causing wanton and deliberate devastation over France and Belgium. She thus consented to pay a huge sum as reparations for the damage done to the civilian population of Belgium and France. The amount payable was later on fixed at 54 billion dollars. Germany ceded Alsace and Lorraine to France; a small strip of territory to Belgium; Upper Silesia and a large portion of Posen and West Prussia to Poland; Danzig, to be converted into an international free city; Memel to Lithuania and portion of Schleswig to Denmark. She consented to the occupation and exploitation of Saar Basin by France for 15 years. The Allies were to remain in military occupation on the left bank of the Rhine until the reparations were paid and the Treaty of Versailles fully executed.

The German lease of Kiaochow along with the Pacific islands north of the Equator were surrendered to Japan, the German Samoa to New Zealand and the rest of the Pacific possessions to Australia. German South West Africa passed on to the Union of South Africa and German East Africa to Great Britain. A small strip in the north-west of German East Africa was handed over to Belgium. Cameroons and Togoland were partitioned between

Britain and France. These German overseas colonies surrendered to the Allies were to be administrated on a system of mandate under the aegis of the League of Nations.

Germany promised to reduce her army to a very low level, to abolish conscription, to raze the Rhenish forts, to reduce her navy to six battle-ships, six light cruisers, and twelve torpedo boats without submarines, and to abandon military and naval aviation. Germany agreed to open the Kiel canal to all nations.

Treaties with Austria, Hungary and Turkey:

By the treaty of St. Germain (Sept. 10, 1919), Austria was required to recognize the complete independence of Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, and to cede the various territories which went to the formation of these new states. Austria lost her Adriatic sea-board which was partitioned between Italy and Yugoslavia. She agreed to pay indemnities and reduced her army.

Hungary ceded the Slovak provinces to Czechoslovakia; Transylvania to Roumania and Croatia to Yugoslavia (Treaty of Trianon, June 4, 1920).

By the treaty of Sevres (August 10, 1920), the Sultan of Turkey agreed to part with all the Asiatic dominions except Asia Minor proper. She surrendered Palestine, Transjordan and Mesopotamia to Britain, and Syria to France; all these were to be held as mandates by Britain and France. Armenia be-

came a free Christian republic and Hedjaz an independent kingdom under British control. Smyrña and the adjacent territory on the Asiatic coast, along with Thrace, Adrianople, Gallipoli and some Aegean islands were ceded to Greece by the Sultan. The Dardanelles and the Bosphorus were internationalised and parts of Asia Minor were recognised as spheres of foreign influence. In addition to all these territorial losses, Turkey was subjected to crushing debts and to organized foreign control over her public finance.

But the republican revolution undid the work of the Allies. The National Assembly at Angora refused to ratify this humiliating treaty. There was also a hitch between France and Britain regarding the partition of the Turkish Empire. Mustapha Kemal took full advantage of this and cleared Asia Minor of all foreign intruders. The Bolshevist Russia was persuaded to sign a treaty with the National Assembly. The Bolsheviks infuriated at the attempts of the Allies to support 'the Whites' against 'the Reds' condemned the treaty of Sevres, disavowed Russian ambitions in the Near East and proclaimed the solidarity of interests of Russia and Turkey against Western imperialism.

Greece backed by Britain fought against the Republic of Angora. But the Greeks were driven out of Asia Minor. The Sultan was deposed (Nov. 1, 1922) and the republicans soon occupied Constantinople.

After a series of difficult negotiations, peace was finally signed at Lausanne (July, 1923).

By this treaty Turkey relinquished all claims over Hedjaz, Palestine, Trans-Jordan, Syria, and Mesopotamia, but retained the whole of Asia Minor proper including Armenia.

Treaty with Bulgaria:

By the treaty of Neuilly (November 27, 1919), Bulgaria had to relinquish all her conquests made during the War and even a large portion of her acquisitions in the Balkan wars to Roumania, Yugoslavia and Greece. She agreed to pay an indemnity and to reduce her army.

Claims of Italy:

The settlement as far as Italy was concerned was a very difficult one, as it involved a dispute between Italy and Yugoslavia. By the secret treaties of 1915 and 1917, Italy was promised the Adriatic Islands and a part of the Dalmatian coast. Italy now claimed all these along with the port of Fiume. The Yugoslavs resisted these claims and Wilson supported them. After a series of difficult negotiations interrupted by Italian adventures to Dalmatia, a settlement was arrived in November, 1920. By the treaty of Rapallo, the northern portion of the coast including Zara, but excluding Fiume, was allotted to Italy, Fiume was declared a free neutralised city and the

remainder of the coast was allotted to Yugoslavia. In 1922, Mussolini coolly occupied Fiume without opposition.

Belgium:

Belgium was released from permanent neutralisation, and restrictions on the navigations of the Scheldt were also removed.

New States:

A whole series of treaties were concluded recognising the independence and integrity of the new states: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia.

The League of Nations:

Wilson's dream of a world concert to guarantee the independence of nations and secure the redress of international disputes by peaceful means found expression in the first sections of the Treaty of Versailles. This contained the Covenant of the League of Nations. The League started with the five Allied great powers, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan and many neutral countries. Germany pointed out that this league was an instrument to guard the spoils of the Allies, and not to promote international peace. The League was inaugurated in January, 1920. The people of U. S. A. however made a scathing criticism of Wilson's conduct at Paris. He was charged with bungling, playing into

the hands of the triumphant Allies, ignoring the claims of many oppressed nationalities and committing U. S. A. to a policy of upholding the unjust peace settlement. The American Senate refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles including the Covenant of the League (March, 1920). In the next Presidential election Wilson was defeated by Warren Harding who declared that the American republic would have no part in the existing League of Nations. This American opposition was really ominous for the nascent concert of nations.

References:

- Pollard: A Short History of the Great War.
Buchan: History of the War.
Ponsonby: Falsehood in Wartime.
Remarque: All Quiet on the Western Front.
Oppenheim: International Law, Vol. 2.
Garner: Recent Developments in International Law.

THE CONSEQUENCES

"The morrow of victory is often more perilous than its eve." (Mazzini)

The Peace of Vengeance:

Any cursory glance over the Paris Peace Settlement is sufficient to convince one that the whole settlement was vitiated by a vindictive spirit, a spirit which is in itself a menace to peace. The imputation of war guilt to Germany, the attempt to try Kaiser, the imposition of heavy reparations inflicted a permanent wound in the minds of the Germans. The occupation of the Rhineland, the partition of of German colonial empire among the Allies, and the destruction of German navy as well as the reduction of the army, all served to expose the uncharitable attitude of the Allies. The statesmen of Versailles were sowing the seeds of a policy of revenge. It must have been evident in 1919 to any far-sighted statesmen^r that Germany would not tolerate this national humiliation. The way was thus paved for the rise of a militarist party in Germany. Herr Hitler stated in his defence in the state trial of 1924 that, Ebert (President of German Republic, 1919) and Scheideamann (German representative at Versailles), who accepted the ignominious treaty were traitors.

Though nationalism was vindicated by recognising the new states of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and

Yugoslavia, the Croats in Yugoslavia and the Germans in Poland were not secured against oppression.

The outlet given to Poland through East Prussia, the so called Polish Corridor, has been a source of discontent between Germany and Poland.

The colonies snatched away from Germany passed to the triumphant Allies under the euphemistic nomenclature of mandate and the nominal supervision of the League.

Gains of Democracy :

The War was the funeral of the divine right and despotism. The Romanovs, the Habsburgs, the Hohenzollerns, the Ottoman Sultans along with a large number of petty dynasties in Germany fell before the onrush of democracy.

The Allies' cry of making the world safe for democracy was to a great extent realised for the time being through unforeseen channels. Democratic republics sprung up in Central Europe, in Russia and in Turkey. Lloyd George had to widen the basis of franchise in Britain, by a reform bill (1918). Responsible government had also to be promised to India.

Nationalism at Discount:

The War, though it fulfilled the aspirations of many oppressed nationalities, served to give a rude shock to the romantic atmosphere created by Mazzini

and Garibaldi. The War exposed the fact that nationalism was a religion which profited the capitalists best.

Fortunes were piled up by armament makers and by other business magnates for which working classes and the youth of the nations paid the price. Modern large-scale warfare with perfected scientific knowledge as its handmaid has no scope for chivalry. Chivalry breathed its last with the last cavalry charges in Flanders.

Socialism and Russia:

As a consequence, socialism became popular throughout Europe, and Russia took the lead in running a government on orthodox communistic principles. This experiment consists of nationalisation of all the industries, and government by means of local councils (soviets). Thus both capitalism and bureaucracy have been sought to be dispensed with.

Socialistic principles have been adopted, though to a very moderate extent, by Britain and other countries. Thus there is much significance in the following remark:

“Democracy (*Swaraj*) has sunk deeper into the human soul than it did in 1848, or 1870”. (Sarkar)

British Empire:

The spirit of teamwork exhibited by the Dominions and the valuable services rendered by them

secured for the Dominions a high status in the Empire. The Dominions demanded equality in status with the mother country. By the Conference of 1926, this had to be granted. (See section on British Commonwealth.)

The cry of making the world safe for democracy put Britain in an embarrassing position in relation to Ireland, Egypt and India. After the War was over Sinn Féin rapidly grew in strength and ultimately secured full self-government. (See section on British Commonwealth) In Egypt the nationalists under the leadership of Zaghlul demanded the termination of British protectorate. In 1922 Britain consented to recognise Egypt as an independent state but with certain safeguards. The *wafd*—the party of Zaghlul—pointed out that these were meant for British commercial and strategic interests and stood in the way of enjoying the fruits of independence. But within a few years the *wafd* was to be outmanœuvred by King Fuad and British High Commissioner Lord Lloyd, an ex-Governor of Bombay.

Impact of the War on India:

Indian nationalist leaders demanded responsible government, pointing to the services rendered by India during the War. In 1917, the critical year of War, Edwin Montague, the Secretary of State for India, had to promise responsible government. The outcome was the Reforms of 1919, but as they fell short of the

expectations of advanced sections of the Indian public, the agitation for responsible government went on. Those leaders who agreed to work these Reforms were called Moderates by Indian National Congress.

The Indian soldiers who fought in the different theatres of the War came back with greater confidence in the abilities of Indians and these soldiers who had intimate knowledge of the livelihood of the European soldiers served a great purpose in dissolving the notion of inferiority complex.

Indian industries also developed to a great extent during the War. During the four years when supplies from abroad were not available, India had to meet the needs of India as well as of the forces in different theatres. The steel and textile industries made wonderful progress under this pressure.

The Khilafat:

The overthrow of the Sultan of Turkey who was also the Khalif, and the establishment of the Turkish Republic put an end to the Khilafat movement. The attempts made to revive the movement failed mainly due to the indifference of the Republicans in Turkey. The failure of the movement was however a great relief to British statesmen.

The Far East and Japan:

Japan stepped "into the industrial and commercial vacuum created by the withdrawal of Germany." (Sarkar) Taking advantage of the preoccupation of

Britain in Near East, immediately after the War, Japan consolidated her gains acquired during the War and proceeded to further exploitation in China, Latin America and East Indies. Within a few years, "Made in Japan" invaded the markets of these areas. She also planned territorial aggressions in China. At a conference called at Washington in 1922, Japan agreed to the proposal of open-door and non-intervention in China. But this profession has been honoured more in breach than in observance. Japan since the last War has been fighting for her 'place in the sun.'

Economic Consequences:

The Allied Powers had to contract huge debts with a view to meeting the needs of the War. America with her enormous resources advanced the loans required. In 1919, the Allies conspired to meet these loans, if possible, by squeezing Germany. Hence the claim for reparations. On the other hand, Germany was prevented from paying in kind. Naturally such a system engendered a race for hoarding cash. Hence protection became a favourite creed. As a result, gold came to be hoarded in France and America. This involved the whole world in an international economic crisis in 1929-33 from the effects of which the world is still suffering.

References :

- Keynes: Economic Consequences of Peace,
Cole: Guide Through World Chaos.
Salter: Recovery.
Muir: Political Consequences of the War.
Buel: Ten years (1918-1928).
Germanus: Modern Movements in Islam (Nizam
lectures: Viswabharati).
Sarkar: The Futurism of Young Asia.
Gandhi: Experiments with Truth, Vol. 2.
Montague: An Indian Diary.
Trotsky: History of Russian Revolution.
Nitti: Decadence of Europe.
-

18th April, 1938.

